Journal of Biblical Literature
Monograph Series, Volume XI

THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK IN THE ANCIENT COMMENTARY FROM QUMRAN

by

William H. Brownlee

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS
224 North Fifteenth Street
Philadelphia 2, Pennsylvania
1959

BS1635
.3B88

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 17 1961
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
BS1635
.H3B88

OCT 21 1959
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Journal of Biblical Literature
Monograph Series, Volume XI

THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK IN THE ANCIENT COMMENTARY FROM QUMRAN

by

William H. Brownlee

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS
224 North Fifteenth Street
Philadelphia 2, Pennsylvania
1959

Copyright 1959
Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis

PHOTOLITHOPRINTED BY CUSHING - MALLOY, INC.
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
1959

PREFACE

The present study was intended as a part of the author's contribution for the completed edition of The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. II, of which only Fascicle 2 has been published by the American Schools of Oriental Research (1951). After the lapse of several years, funds were still unavailable for its publication. Consequently the studies planned for that volume were released last year for publication elsewhere.

It is hoped that the study of the Habakkuk variants in the ancient Midrash Pesher of Qumran will be followed eventually by the exposition of the commentary material itself. In the projected work, each section of commentary will be numbered as by A. Dupont-Sommer, "Le 'Commentaire d'Habaccuc' découvert près de la Mer Morte. Traduction et notes," Revue de l'histoire des Religions, CXXXVII, No. 2 (1950), pp. 129-171. In anticipation, cross references to these pericopes already employ the symbol ¶.

Wm. H. Brownlee
Duke University Divinity School
February 3, 1959

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	iii
ABBREVIATIONS	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
COLLATION OF THE HABAKKUK TEXT IN DSH	5
ANALYSIS OF TEXTUAL FINDINGS	96
(1) Orthographic Features	96
(2) Principal Variants	108
(3) The Character of the Recension	113
(4) The Presence of Dual Readings	118
(5) The Medieval Manuscripts and DSH	124

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS

AJSLL = American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature

Aq. = Greek text of the Aquila version of the Old Testament

BA = The Biblical Archaeologist

BASOR = Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research

BH = Biblia Hebraica, edited by Rud. Kittel, Stuttgart. The third and seventh editions are cited.

BO = Bibliotheca Orientalis

def. = defective

def. = defectiva

DSH = the Dead Sea Habakkuk "Commentary," the pesher from the first Qumran Scroll Cave, more accurately designated as 1QpHab

DSS = Dead Sea Scrolls, or more specifically the Qumran Scrolls

DSS = The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. I, New Haven, 1950

DST = The Dead Sea Thanksgiving Scroll, a hymn (hodayoth) scroll from the first Qumran Scroll Cave

G = the Greek text of the Septuagint Version

Ges. = Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, as edited and enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch, second English edition, revised in accordance with the twenty-eighth German Edition (1909) by A. E. Cowley, Oxford, 1910

Gins. = C. D. Ginsburg's edition of the Hebrew Old Testament, cited below, at p. 4.

inf. = infinitive

inf. ab. = infinitive absolute

JBL = Journal of Biblical Literature

JQR = The Jewish Quarterly Review

JTS = The Journal of Theological Studies

Kenn. = B. Kennicott's edition of the Hebrew Old Testament, cited below, at p. 3.

Meg. Gen. I & II = Megillot Genuzot, the two preliminary studies of E. L. Sukenik, I, 1948, II, 1950, published by the Bialik Foundation, Jerusalem.

Ms(s). = manuscripts

MT = the Massoretic Text of the Hebrew Old Testament

NRTH = Nouvelle Revue Théologique

PEQ = Palestine Exploration Quarterly

pl. = plural

pl. = plene

ptcp. = participle

RB = Revue Biblique

RHR = Revue de l'Histoire des Religions

S = the Syriac Version of the Old Testament

SBLE = The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis

scr. def. = scriptio defectiva

scr. pl. = scriptio plena

STh = Studia Theologica

Symm. = Symmachus' Greek Version of the Old Testament

T = the Aramaic Targum of the Old Testament

ThLZ = Theologische Literaturzeitung

ThZ = Theologische Zeitschrift

V = the Latin Vulgate of Jerome

VT = Vetus Testamentum

ZAW = Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

ZKT = Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie

INTRODUCTION

The pesher of Habakkuk, from the first Qumran Scroll Cave, makes an important contribution to the textual criticism of the Book of Habakkuk. This contribution warrants careful and extended investigation; and since it represents a special interest quite distinct from the religious and historical interpretations contained in the document, it is fitting that we consecrate a special monograph to that investigation.

A modest beginning in such investigation was made in a paper read at the Textual Criticism Seminar held in connection with the national meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, convened in New York, December, 1948. That paper was not published, however, because the present writer believed that any true evaluation of textual variants required much more painstaking study than was possible up to that time. In the subsequent years attention was given to preparing such a study for inclusion within the now defaulted Vol. II of The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Meanwhile many contributions were made on the subject which served to enrich and enlarge the treatment. The purpose of the present monograph is to pull together the observations and judgments of all the scholars as to the distinctive readings of DSH (1QpHab) and their value for Old Testament textual criticism.[1]

---

[1]This study was written substantially in its present form in the autumn of 1954, and has been subject to only minor editorial revisions since that date. Still little of note has been published on the subjec since then.

The major contributions in this investigation are as follows:

Georg Molin, "Der Habakkukommentar von ʿEn Feŝha in der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft," Theologische Zeitschrift, 8 Jahrgang, Heft 5, Sept./Oct., 1952, pp. 340-357.

Karl Elliger, Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tubingen, 1953, Chapter III, pp. 48-58.

Stanislav Segert, "Zur Habakkuk-Rolle aus dem Funde vom Toten Meer," I-IV, Archiv Orientální, XXI, 1953, pp. 218-239; XXII, 1954, pp. 99-113; pp. 444-459; XXIII, 1955, pp. 178-183.

The work of Segert is the most thorough study to date. His observations are the most complete as regards the testimony of all the ancient versions including the less well known ones. In some cases we are heavily indebted to him, although (as is natural in this type of investigation) many of the same observations had been made independently.

Besides these major contributions, there have been many briefer treatments. Translators of the pesher have included incidentally in their notes some observations concerning, or judgments of, the textual variants. Also many short articles have been written on the scroll, with attention being given to the textual value of the document. All these will be duly noted as we proceed with the investigation of the variants, with bibliographical references being given there. Often we shall refer to the views of well known Biblical critics as to the text of Habakkuk, pointing out where they preferred certain readings based upon the versions or resting perhaps upon sheer conjecture; for it is reassuring to the textual critic to see how many are the insights of previous scholars which seem now to be confirmed by the newly discovered document. However, we shall make no attempt

to present a higher criticism of the book (except for a few brief notes relating to the omission of the third chapter), nor is this the place to treat all conjectured emendations going beyond extant testimony, though incidentally a few may be mentioned when they may affect our judgment of the value of a particular reading. Thus almost no attempt has been made to press beyond the processes of textual criticism to the text of the original prophet.

Notations will be kept at a minimum. Where a scholar's observations accompany his translation of the Habakkuk scroll and may be readily found by turning to the relevant portions of his translation, the page numbers are not given. Similarly, in quoting the views of critics whose textual notes accompany verse by verse the text of Habakkuk in their works, it has not been deemed necessary to give pagination. Much fuller annotation of this kind will be found in Segert's monumental studies (op. cit.). In citing him, we take advantage of his numbered paragraphs which continue in sequence through his entire series of four articles; for this will be exact enough reference for the student of the literature. The various languages of the versions are quoted in proper script, where quoted directly, except the Syriac, for which we have substituted the exact Hebrew-Aramaic equivalents. This was done in order to facilitate the typing and to enlarge the number of comprehending readers when the Syriac is quoted.

The present study is the first to collate DSH against the variants of Medieval Hebrew manuscripts. Our sources are:

B. Kennicott, Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus, Oxford, 1776, 1780 (2 vols.).

J. B. de Rossi, Variae lectiones Veteris Testamenti ex immensa manu scriptorum editorumque codicum congerie haustae, Parma, 1798 (4 vols.).

[C.] David Ginsburg, עשרים וארבעה ספרי הקדש מדויקים היטב על פי המסורה ועל פי דפוסים ראשונים עם חלופים והגהות מן כתבי יד עתיקים והרגומים שנים, London, 2 vols., 1894.

The value of this examination is the demonstration that many of the same variants (particularly the orthographic ones and the addition or omission of the conjunction Waw) appear also in Medieval manuscripts. Moreover, we must entertain the possibility that some of these readings are primitive in the sense that they antedate a fully standardized Massoretic recension. In such cases the agreement would be more than coincidental. At any rate, a collation against these readings should provide useful information for any inquiry as to whether this is so.[2]

Our procedure is to number each variant according to its word order in the Hebrew text, and in general to list them all one by one in precisely this order. In a few cases where it has seemed convenient within a single verse to treat interrelated variants together, part of the numbers have been grouped together. In such cases unrelated variants may be lifted out for separate listing, or a variant may be listed a second time for special observations concerning it alone, as orthography. Hence there are some minor modifications as to the sequence of the presentation; yet always each variant retains its proper number and is treated within the scope of its own particular verse. As our standard Hebrew text, we have adopted S. Baer, נביאים אחרונים ספר תרי עשר, Liber Duodecim Prophetarum, Lipsiae, 1878.[3] Variants from this

---

[2]Cf. Henry S. Gehman, "Manuscripts of the Old Testament in Hebrew," BA, VIII, 4, pp. 100-103.

[3]The only substantial differences between this text in the two chapters of Habakkuk here examined and the Leningrad Ms. followed in Rud. Kittel's Biblia Hebraica (Stuttgart, 3rd-7th

text appear as the major numbers, i.e., those which are not further annotated by appended letters (such as 17a or 52b, etc.). However, this system is supplemented by indicating under subordinate listings where readings in agreement with the standard MT text are in disagreement with some other Massoretic readings. Likewise, at numerous points some uncertainty attaches to the reading of the scroll, or other scholars have read differently. These readings are given consideration through the subordinate system of lettered numbers. Scribal errors that were corrected anciently are also noted through the same system (as in Nos. 10a, 29a, 53a, 119a), except where a word restored by a corrector departs from the Massoretic spelling (as in Nos. 22 and 96). This procedure has resulted in the listing of 125 variants in the extant Habakkuk text of DSH. The additional subordinate numbers total thirty-one.

Following the collation, we shall present graphically the overall survey of the variants of this Habakkuk text.

Collation of the Habakkuk Text in DSH

1. ורלוא, 1 scr.pl.; MT 1:2 ולא.

1a. Nearly all scholars have followed me in restoring the text of 1.5 (Hab. 1:3a) in exact agreement with the MT, רעלסל[חבים. F.A.W. van't La

---

editions) are Baer's defective spellings ורזנים (1:10), כתב (2:2) and בגר (2:5). The last two are inconsequential for the present comparison, since in the case of 2:2 the word is lost through the incompleteness of the Ms. and in the case of 2:5 the text of DSH is in any case quite different. The first reading, however, is in exact accord with DSH and the Hebrew texts of Kennicott, Ginsburg, Letteris, and Cassuto (The Magnes Press, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1953) -- the last mentioned being a correction of the Ginsburg edition in the light of Cassuto's collation of the famous Aleppo MS. Though Cassuto's collation was against the Letteris text rather than that of Ginsburg, it is reassuring to observe that the Cassuto edition reads defectively at 2:5, despite the scr.pl. בגר of Ginsburg.

and A. S. van der Woude,[4] however, restore ו[מע]ל תב[ים after the commentary to the text (i.6) בעשק ומעל. But here we have commentary, not quotation, the interpretative equations being ארן=עשק and עמל=מעל. Cf. מרחוק=ממרחק (iii.7,10). The calculation of the space between the extant ם and ' is crucial and determinative here; for unfortunately the trace of the first letter to the left of ם is such that it could be either an ע or a ל. Cf. the last word of i.3. In the line immediately below the break, the space is fully occupied by the four letters of בעשק. Restoration according to the MT requires room for three letters and a space between words, whereas that of van 't Land and van der Woude requires room for four letters and a space. On this basis it would seem that there is not room for their restored text. Yet one may easily deceive himself into thinking that there is room, by taking the measurement of ועמל as it occurs in i.6, adding next to this a small space for word separation, and then following this with תב calculated according to the first two letters of בתורת in i.11. It will all appear to fit neatly into the gap, provided one in taking the measurement of the first word fails to assign it sufficient length to include all the area overshadowed by ל, whose top characteristically angles to the left. There is usually about half a space to the left of the upper tip of the ל before the beginning of another word. This spacing, together with the empty area beneath the letter (where within a word a letter actually begins), gives the impression of a full space between words. Sometimes the spacing between words is greater and sometimes less, but it would be hazardous to restore the text according to the assumption of unusual crowding.

---

[4] De Habakkuk-rol von 'Ain Faša, Tekst en Vertaling, Met een Woord vooraf van Prof. Dr. Th. C. Vriezen, van Gorcum Assen, 1954.

2. The article with המשפט, i.14, is not attested in the MT 1:4. The occurrence of the article in the versions is of uncertain value for textual criticism. Elliger's preference (op. cit., p. 48) for the article on metrical grounds is of doubtful merit, in view of the flexible character of Hebrew poetry.

3. The use of בוגדים, ii.1, doubtless implies the reading הבוגדים or בוגדים for MT 1:5 בגדים in the non-extant last line of i. This reading is supported by G and Acts 13:41 οἱ καταφρονηταί and by S מרחא; but there is nothing here to determine certainly whether the Vorlage of G or S employed the article, as assumed by Procksch (BH$^{3-7}$) and G. Molin (ThZ, 8, 5, 1952, pp. 348 f.). The vocative prefers the article but may occur without it, and the textual variation is more simply explained if the word was anarthrous, as A. M. Habermann proposes (ʿĒdâh wᵉ-ʿĒdûth, Mahbarôth le-Sifrûth, Jerusalem, 1952, p. 44). Several critics had opposed the reading of the Greek to that of the MT, and they would seem to be vindicated by DSH, whose reading is better suited to the contest. Molin may be overly cautious in suggesting that it fits too well. Either reading could arise as an error of the eye. But cf. B. Duhm's defense of the MT (Das Buch Habakkuk, Text, Übersetzung und Erklärung, Tübingen, 1906).

4. ספר' (scr. pl.) ii.1; MT 1:5 ספר'.

5. The restoration א'[כ] for כ' , ii.10, is assured by occurrences elsewhere in this and other documents of the Qumran literature of this form of the particle with "metathetic" א -- an orthographic feature not found in MT. The word occurs without א in this document only in its twice occurring citation of כי אתה (MT 2:8), viii.15

and ix.3. Segert, No. 63, notes that this occurs before א and plausibly suggests that it is to be explained as due to (intentional?) haplography. In ix.14 (MT 2:11), he notes, כי״א is found before א, but there it stands at the end of the line and the following א is the first letter of the next line. Against this interpretation, however, cf. מפי״א אל, ii.2 f.; note also מפי הכוהן, ii.7 f.

6. הכשדא׳ם ii.11 for MT 1:6 הכשד׳ים is (as I explained at the SBLE meeting, December, 1948) probably an Aramaism. Cf. הכשדא׳ן in Dan. 3:8; 5:11. The alternative, suggested by Segert (No. 73), of interpreting the noun termination as phonetic îʾîm for îyyîm (cf. K כשד״ים Ezek. 23:14; II Chr. 36:17) is less likely, for this should have been הכשד׳א׳ם. Cf. כת׳א׳ם in DSH for כת״ים. (The same form is attested in the MT of Jer. 2:10 also.) Cf., however הנכא׳ם = הנב׳א׳ם (vii.5, 8).

B. Duhm (op. cit.), followed by others,[5a] wished to read "Kittim" here rather than "Chaldaeans," regarding the latter as a marginal gloss which was substituted for the primitive reading, or perhaps as a corruption of "Kittim." This hypothesis arose from the conviction that the prophet must be speaking of the Greeks, despite 1:6. Ancient sectaries who wished to apply the book to their own contemporaries (Greeks or Romans) did not need to emend, but they interpreted according to their whims "aussi arbitrairement que l'ont fait des modernes qui voulurent etre savants," says R. de Vaux (La Vie Intellectuelle, June, 1949, p. 593). On the other hand, Robert North (PEQ, April, 1955, p. 6) regards the reference to "Kittim" as "an astounding confirmation of Duhm's clairvoyant emendation." The

---

5a Most notably by C. C. Torrey, Alexander the Great in the Old Testament Prophecies, Festschrift for K. Marti, Beih. 41, Z.A.W., 1925, p. 283.

most that can be suggested, it seems to me, is that there may have been a tradition of regarding kaśdîm as a surrogate for kittîm. The influence of the Targum on the interpretations of our document shows that tradition played a part in the shaping of the expositions; but this interpretation is not found in the Targum as we have it.

G reads τοὺς Χαλδαίους τοὺς μαχητάς, the added phrase usually translating הגבורים in the Minor Prophets. Procksch (BH$^{3-7}$) suggests that the latter may be original, הכשרים being secondary. Ed. Nielsen (STh, Vol. VI, Fasc. i, p. 63, n. 1) explains: "This view entails that the prophecy of Habakkuk presents itself as a piece of unadulterated cult-prophecy, which was only historicized by a later age by interpreting 'hag-gibbôrîm' of the Chaldeans and incorrectly adding these in the text." He, however, suggests that τοὺς μαχητάς may be a gloss added to prevent the confusion of Χαλδαίους with astrologers as the term was employed in later Greek usage, and that it may also have originated under the influence of הגוי המר, inasmuch as מר-נפש "in some places denotes the professional warriors or robber bands which war-chieftains such as David assembled (I Sam. xxii, 2)," and that finally the gibbôrîm may have been introduced in Hab. i, 6 LXX under the influence of Jer. v.16. We would urge, on the other hand, the possibility that this was a Hebrew gloss in the Vorlage of G, since "Chaldaeans" even in the Hebrew and Aramaic Daniel frequently means "astrologers." By an interesting coincidence, the Kittim are characterized as gibbôrîm in DSH ii.12 (commentary on Hab. 1:6). This surely suggests the interpretative origin of the addition in G or its Vorlage.

7. לוא(scr. pl.) iii.2; MT 1:6 לא. This is the only spelling in DSH, but it never finds support in the medieval MSS when it appears in DSH. Kennicott lists the variants לו לר 161; לא ommitted, 4.

8. אי֯רם iii.2: MT 1:7 אי֯ם. This has considerable support in the MSS: Gins. 7, 10, 11, 21, 27, 34, 40, 69; Kennicott 1, 2, 30, 72, 89, 93, 96, 112, 126, 150, 172, 178, 224, 226, 227, 243, 252, 253; primo 113, 141.

8a. ונורא (scr.pl.); so also MT 1:7; but Kenn. 258, 260, 264, ונרא.

9. Puzzling is וקול iii.6; MT 1:8 וקלו. G. Molin (ThZ, 1952, p. 349), as most translators, considers it a scribal error. Van der Ploeg (BO, VIII, No. 1, 1951, p. 3) regards the verb in DSH as singular in agreement with מרסו which according to him is a collective singular; but the vocalization gôl from QLL could only be the Qal infinitive construct, or possibly the infinitive absolute -- the latter is read by Segert (No. 161), who states that it is used in the function of a finite verb. וקול occurs in the Old Testament only as the noun "voice" with the conjunction "and" (e.g. I Sam. 15:14; Jer. 42:14). Jer. 3:9 has a hapax legomenon, מקול; here qôl is commonly assumed to be a noun meaning "lightness," which might conceivably be employed in DSH in the sense of "fleetness," the attributive idea being represented by the noun, as some grammarians interpret משחת מא֯ש in Is. 52:14. In view of the identify of ו and י in our document, one could read יקול or יקיל. The former would be attractive as a Qal imperfect; but the vocalization yiqqôl, though in line with some ע"ע verbs, would contrast with the yēqal of the O.T. (cf. Gen 16:4, 5; I Sam. 2:30). The latter could be

read as a Hi. imperfect, yaqêl--the sere being represented by a י as in the Aph. of Aramaic; but this would yield no appropriate sense here. It is of doubtful textual value to observe with Segert that "the versions (T, S, V) have here a form of stative verb corresponding to an adjective; only the Greek has a finite verbal form of 3rd person pl." Though Segert cites this to support his reading of the infinitive, it could favor just as well the reading of the attributive noun, but quite uncertainly. The parallelism with והדר favors the MT וקלו, but one must not

resort to emendation before making every effort to find an appropriate sense for the present reading. It seems most probable that we are confronted here with an error of metathesis, as E. L. Sukenik held (MG ii, p. 89).

10. סרסר iii.6, doubtless only scr. def. for MT 1:8 סוסי ; for despite the uncertainty of the first verb (cf. No. 9) the second is clearly a plural (cf. Nos. 12-13). The only occurrence of סרסר in the Old Testament is II Kings 5:9, where the MT interprets it as a defective spelling of the plural, "his horses." (Cf. Deut. 11:4 for similar phrasing with scr. pl.). The only close parallel is Jer. 4:13, where verb and noun are both plural. Though סוס is frequently a collective in the O.T., as van der Ploeg observes (loc. cit.), that interpretation does not fit the present passage.

10a. In the writing of מואבי, iii.7 (Hab. 1:8), the י was first omitted and then inserted above the line, the correction having probably been made by the same scribe.

11-14. The next four variants are so interrelated that they require collective treatment. The part of Hab. 1:8 quoted in iii.7f may be scanned as follows:

פשׁו ופרשׁו פרשׁו מרחוק
יעופו כנשׁר חשׁ לאכול

For this MT reads, as scanned by O. Procksch (BH$^{3-7}$):

ופשׁו פרשׁיו ופרשׁיו מרחוק יבאו
יעפו כנשׁר חשׁ לאכול

The major variants of DSH in this short text are four in number: (11) absence of conjunction ו in the first word; (12) reading of the coordinate verb ופרשׂוּ for the noun פרשׂיו as the second word; (13) omission of the conjunction ו with third word; (14) the omission of באו׳. (Purely orthographic features appear below, separately listed.) The second and third of these variants may be explained by simple transposition in a text defectively spelled, changing the position of the conjunction. This disturbance of the syntax accounts for the treatment of פרשׂיו as a noun in both of its occurrences in MT, whereas in DSH פרשׂו is first a verb and then a noun. The resultant separation of these two words by the conjunction perhaps explains the addition of באו׳ in MT; for in this verse the text of DSH is superior, as will be seen in the following discussion.

That the MT was not in order has been apparent from difficulties of scansion, and it seemed confirmed by the suspicious immediate repetition of pārāšāw. In 1938 (JTS, Vol. 39, pp. 394 f.) G. R. Driver suggested that in the second instance one should read the verb par^{e}śu, and that the line be read thus:

וּפָשְׂגּ פרשׂיו וּפָרְשׂוּ מרחוק יבאו

The resulting rhythm is 3/2 in agreement (according to him) with that of the preceding line. However, the second stichos of the preceding line is generally read with three beats; and certainly the remainder of the verse is not brought into the 3/2 pattern (see further below).

The presence of two co-ordinate verbs, together with the omission of ובאו, seems to be the best explanation of G, as I noted at the SBLE meeting of 1948, and as G. Molin (loc. cit.) has independently observed. The text was precisely the same as for DSH except for the conj. ו before the first verb and for the order of the next two words, which was ופרשו דרכו as in the MT--only here the second was interpreted as a verb rather than a noun. The Greek reads as follows:

καὶ ἐξιππάσονται οἱ ἵπποι αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁρμήσουσιν μακρόθεν.

It is evident that one of the Hebrew verbs of MT 1:8 is not represented here. M. Segert (Nos. 233-235) believes that the first verb ופשו was missing in the Heb. Vorlage of G. His argument is based upon the fact that the Heb. √פרש is translated in its two other occurrences (Jer. 50:11 [G 27:11]; Mal. 3:20 [English, 4:2]) as σκιρτᾶν "to spring," from which he concludes that ἐξιππάσονται represents a verb √פרש derived from the noun פרש, "horse rider." In this case one would have to infer (No. 236) that ὁρμήσονται renders MT ובאו. On the other hand, O. Lehmann (PEQ, Jan., 1951, p. 38) seems to assume the omission of this word in the LXX and would relate both Greek verbs to the √פרש. He notes that beneath פשו in DSH there is probably to be recognized a first writing עשר, "a good old text." By taking advantage of the identity of ו and י he is able to read an inf. abs. construction: עשר יפרשו. This he would compare with a hypothetical Vorlage of G, which read

ופרש ׳פרשו. The verb was taken possibly in two senses by G, first as "ride forth" and then as "burst forth" (cf. Aram. פרה), and it was therefore given a double translation. The V diffundentur equites ejus may represent a Heb. reading like that of G or DSH. For an inf. abs. of another verb similar in sound to the finite verb with which it is joined, Lehmann cites A. B. Davidson, Hebrew Syntax, No. 86 c, Rem. 2. A natural objection to Lehmann's reconstructed Vorlage is that nothing in G would suggest the inf. abs. construction, as against the coordinate. Although on the surface it is plausible to connect ἐξιππάσονται with paraš (horse, or horseman), as both Segert and Lehmann do, this meaning of the word is not generally recognized by lexicographers; it would seem to represent accordingly a misunderstanding on the part of G. Both scholars would therefore read פָּרָשׁ rather than פָּרַשׁ in the text of Hab. Cf. also G. R. Driver (loc. cit., also JTS, vol. 38, pp. 40 f.). Habermann (Ḥedah we-ʿEduth, ad loc.) reads פָּרַשׁ. Also the reading פשר (primo DSH) is of doubtful meaning in this context. Lehmann compares, however, Aram. paʿel פְּשַׁר meaning "disengage, tear loose." But Jastrow, who gives this meaning for both Aram. and post Biblical Heb., cites examples only in the transitive rather than the intransitive sense required here. This reading was regarded anciently as an error and was corrected to פשר. The error arose (as explained in BASOR 116, p. 15), through confusion of פשר with the expository formula pešer, as is witnessed by erroneous paragraphing before the word (according to custom before

peśer) in the middle of the verse. It does not seem impossible that the rare word פשר could have been translated as ἐξιππάσονται this once, in agreement with the present context. In the other two passages (cited above), calves rather than horsemen are referred to, and the gamboling of calves might naturally call for a different Greek verb than the bounding of cavalrymen. At any rate, two occurrences of σκιρτᾶν are too few to establish an invariable rule of translation. Lehmann is doubtless right in connecting ὁρμήσουσιν with ורפרשו; the logical conclusion from this (in agreement with the syntax of G) is that the preceding verb represents פשר(ו) and that MT ובאו is not represented by G. This explanation has the advantage of interpreting the hypothetical Heb. Vorlage of G in harmony with the known Heb. text of DSH. The judgment of G. Molin here seems assured, especially in view of D. Barthélemy's report (RB, vol. LX, p. 29) that a comparison of the Greek text of the newly discovered Palestinian recension shows that it contained a translation of ובאו, in contrast with the LXX which is thus seen to support DSH.

It may be that the author of DSH was acquainted with the reading ובאו appearing in MT; for in its interpretation, ממרחק ובואו corresponds closely to MT ובאו מרחוק. The difference in the first word of DSH may well be only the substitution of a synonym, and the second word is so common that its occurrence here may be accidental. Cf. Elliger (op. cit., p. 49, n. 1). Therefore this was not presented among the double readings pointed out to the SBLE in December, 1948. Cf. also BASOR 114, p. 9; DSS, vol. I, p. xx. In view of other examples of the use

of another reading in the commentary than the one cited directly, it did not seem to be an unreasonable suggestion, and so it was presented in BA, vol. XIV, no. 3, p. 63. This view seems to receive the endorsement of Paul Kahle (BH^7).

G. Molin (op. cit., pp. 349 f.) suggests that perhaps the decision between DSH and MT should be made on the basis of meter. Elliger has similarly proposed; and both agree that rhythmic considerations favor the MT. Elliger assumes that the rhythm should be a regular 3/3, which, however, the MT does not yield; and in his proposed rearrangement, which would place "v 8aγ" in v. 9, he must assume the dropping out of the third beat. The rhythm of Hab. is not uniformly 3/3, however; and not all the irregularities are to be ascribed to editorial arrangement or addition. A seldom understood and appreciated rhythm[5] is 2/2 (often capable of scansion as 4/4 also, according as one includes more or less within a stichos). The Heb. scansion presented above discloses the natural 2/2 (or 4/4) rhythm of Hab. 1:8b. This is in a context of 3/3, to be sure,

---

5. My theory of scansion is that individual words receive one beat, except where they may be combined with another under a single beat. Thus a particle may be combined with the word following, as also a noun in the construct--although such combinations are not to be assumed unless the words are very brief or metrical context seems to suggest this. Hebrew rhythm is very flexible. No rigid system of meter with syllable counting is to be admitted. Convenience of normal or natural pronunciation, however, may determine within flexible limits the number of syllables which may be pronounced together under a single stress. In very rare cases one may perhaps allow two beats to a single word.

but the rhythm of Heb. poetry varies freely according to thought and mood, so that no radical criticism is required in every departure from contextual meter. The "galloping" rhythm of 2/2 (or 4/4) is especially suitable to the description of speeding horses. An exactly parallel case is Ezek. 26:10, where 2/2 (or 4/4) appears after the 3/3 of 26:9! All these rhythmic considerations favor DSH (or the similar text of G) over the MT. Segert (Nos 282 and 287), who divides the stichos differently, according to his analyses finds the rhythm of DSH more regular here.

The orthographic features of the Heb. text presented above may be singled out for separate listing, in which each variant receives its proper number, as below.

12-13. For the scr. def. ופרשו פרשו iii.7 (MT 1:8 plene ופרש'ו ופרש'ו) cf. ופרשו in Kenn. 149. Scr. def. is implied also by G. Cf. above under Nos. 11-14.

14a. For the commentary-attested scr. pl. ובוא' iii.11 (MT ובא') cf. Kenn. 91, 96, 112, 139, 283.[6]

15. וערפ' iii.8; MT 1:8 ועפ'. The scr. pl. of DSH is witnessed by Kenn. 1, 30, 89, 96, 112, 113, 126, 150, 154, 155, 172, 175, 180, 224, 253, 258, 260, primo 82, and by Gins.

---

6. I do not count this orthography among the principal variants because it does not come in the citation. It is the omission of this word which is properly a variant; v.s. Nos. 11-14.

3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 21, 27, 34, 37, 69; edd. 1, 3. Cf. also עיפר' in Kenn. 2.

15a. לאכול plene in both MT and DSH, but cp. scr. def. in Kenn. 1, 2, 4, 17, 29, 30, 72, 89, 91, 93, 94, 96, 102, 116, 126, 128, 141, 150, 154, 158, 159, 161, 172, 182, 224, 242, 243, 245, 252, 258, 260, 264; Gins. 3, 7, 10, 13, 15, 26, 27, 34, 40, 50, 68; edd. 1, 3, 10.

16. One must certainly restore כ[ולו iii.8 (MT 1:9 כלה), not כ[ול (L. Rost, ThLZ 75, col. 478) nor כ[לו (Habermann). DSH=MT Q; MT K probably represents an older orthography wherein the pronominal suffix ō is represented by ה. G's συντέλεια implies kālâh, read as a noun, and so confirms the orthography of MT. Cf. כולה Kenn. 112; כלו Kenn. 160, 602, primo 82, 141, 150. For the evidence that this word was punctuated with the preceding verse by the author of DSH, cf. exposition of DSH ¶11.

16a. יבוא iii. 8 plene; so most MSS of MT 1:9; but scr. def. in Kenn. 1, 2, 3, 4, 17, 29, 30, 72, 82, 89, 93, 94, 96, 112, 113, 128, 141, 150, 154, 158, 159, 161, 172, 178, 224, 243, 246, 249, 252, 253, 258, 260, 264; Gins. 3, 7, 11, 21, 24, 27, 37, 40, 69; edd. 1, 3, 10.

17. פנו הם or פנ' הם iii.9; MT 1:9 פניהם. In transc., DSS I, Pl. LVI, my insistence that the space was accidental constrained the principal editor (against his original judgment) to print

the text as one word. The reading פנ' הם was proposed by Isaac Rabinowitz, JBL, March, 1950, pp. 35 f. The other alternative was presented in BA, XIV, 3, p. 63, n. 30. Segert (No. 237), who cannot decide between these alternatives, suggests the possibility of הם being ham (noise?), the hapax legomenon of Ezek. 7:11, rather than the pronoun as Rabinowitz first suggested. With the reading פנ'ו=פנו, cf. פנ'ו (replacing פנ'הם) in Kenn. 180; this doubtless has nothing to do with DSH, but is intended to eliminate an inconsistency of number. The reading of DSH (which Elliger, op. cit., p. 49 rejects) may be of interpretive origin. See the exposition of DSH 9|11.

18. קד'ם iii.9; MT 1:9 קדימה. This could be simply a matter of the presence or absence of the ה-directive, but the briefer form admits of a different sense, "east wind" rather than "east(ward)." The former sense is supported by T רוחא קדומא, V ventus urens, Symm. and Theodotion ἄνεμος καύσων and now the Palestinian Recension (see D. Barthelemy, RB, vol. 60, p. 27) του προσωπου αυτων καυσων. The same may be claimed for the reading עש'ן of S. G. Lambert (NRTh, vol. 74, no. 3, 1952, p. 291, n. 112) presents also the support of Theodoret for קד'ם; and Molin (op. cit., p. 350) believes that G ἐξ ἐναντίας renders קדם --a reasonable guess though Heb. qedem does not have precisely this rendering elsewhere. G. V. Stonehouse (The Book of Habakkuk, London, 1911, p. 174) bases upon I Sam. 13:5 the supposition that G read the consonants קרמת; but that

word appears only in the construct and is not suitable to the final position of a clause. Van der Ploeg (op. cit., p. 3) regards this reading of DSH as very remarkable since the Qumran MSS have the tendency to employ more often the Hê termination. This fact, together with the support of the versions, seems to prove the originality of the omission. The versions are not necessarily right in their interpretation.

19. יקלס (not וקלס as in the first printing of the editio princeps) iv.1; MT 1:10 יתקלס. Probably Pi'el (attested in O.T. only in Ezek. 16:31), supplanting the Hithpa'el; so L. Rost (ThLZ, 1950, col. 479), Habermann, and Segert (No. 158). Molin (ThZ, 1952, pp. 350 f.) suggests that it may also be a case of carelessness or assimilation. Against the former alternative, one will note וקלס in the commentary, iv.3. The versions can be of no assistance here.

19a. מרונים (scr. def.) iv.1, in agreement with most MSS of MT 1:10; but cp. מרוננים Kenn. 23, 29, 94, 96, 112, 126, 139, 154, 155, 225, 226, 242, 245, 277. BH$^{3-7}$, following the Leningrad MS, reads plene; whereas the new Hebrew Bible published in the name of Umberto Cassuto retains the scr. def.

20. והוא iv.3, for MT 1:10 הוא, may be readily explained as dittography of the last letter of the preceding word (לו) in DSH, or as haplography in MT. So Segert (No. 222), who presents in support of DSH: (1) the parallelism with the same word containing the conjunction at the beginning of the verse;

(2) the versions, G, T (Codex Reuchlin, but not usual later text), and S. The first argument may serve equally to explain the origin of the variant, and perhaps also in Kenn. 96, 102 and Gins. 2, 13, which agree with DSH. However, the combination of DSH, the versions (except V), and even a few MSS of MT is impressive evidence for the conjunction.

21. לכול iv.4 (scr. pl.); MT 1:10 לכל.

22. An original צבור', iv.4, has been corrected by a supralinear ', which apparently occasions the reinterpretation of the ' of the first script as ו (the letters being identical in shape), thus producing a text in agreement with MT 1:10 וצבר except for the scr. pl., which however is found in Kenn. 112. It may well be that the initial צבור' was an error of haplography, since the versions uphold the conjunction of the corrector and of MT.

23. וילכדהו iv.4 (MT 1:10 וילכדה) agrees with MT Q; K is an error(?) of the feminine pronominal suffix for the masculine (Q clearly regards it as masculine), or it represents an archaic spelling in which, as Segert (No. 83) suggests, הו=ה as in דעהה' in Lachish Letter III, line 6. Segert further notes that the ו in the older script resembles the left side of the ה, so that the letter may have fallen out through blending with the preceding ה.

23a. עבר' iv.9 (scr. def.); so also MT 1:11, but Kenn. 112 ויעבור.

24. וישלח iv.9; MT 1:11 וישאל. A crux interpretum, with three possible derivations. (1) The first reaction was to derive it from √שׁלח , and to regard it as confirming the emendation of the text proposed by Wellhausen, who was followed by Duhm (op. cit.), Nowack, Marti, Sellin, Procksch (BH$^{3-7}$), Horst (with modification), J. M. P. Smith (in An American Translation), and others.[7] The argument is principally syntactical. By linking the verb with what follows, rather than with what precedes, the final clause of the verse is better integrated into the verse. The meter is also made regular. The interpretation is not in accord with DSH, however, where (when the clause is lifted out for separate comment) the quotation at iv.13 (as certainly to be restored) begins with ויאל .

(2) Another possible derivation is from √שׁאל in accord with MT and all the versions except V. As noted from the

---

7. As advanced by J. Wellhausen (Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt, mit Noten, Skizzen und Vorabeiten, V, Berlin, 1892), the emendation is spelled precisely as in DSH and unpointed. Marti (Das Dodekapropheton, Kurzer Handcommentar zum Alten Testament, Tübingen, 1904) and Sellin (Das Zwölfprophetenbuch übersetzt und erklärt, Kommentar zum Alten Testament, Leipzig, 1930) vocalize the form as a ו-consecutive imperfect. Nowack (Die kleinen Propheten, Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, III, 4, 1st ed., 1897, 2nd ed., 1903) vocalized with a simple ו before the imperfect. Procksch proposes וישלח and Friedrich Horst (in Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, edited by T. H. Robinson, Handbuch zum Alten Testament, 14, Tübingen, 1938) further modifies the emendation so as to read וישׁלח אשׁר : but in the 1954 edition Horst abandons this emendation in favor of his understanding of DSH. Cf. below.

beginning, [אבמ]ות iv.11 could well allude to the reading ראשם--an illustration of the midrashist's ability to use more than one reading in his exposition.[8] J. van der Ploeg (op. cit., p. 36), however, would eliminate the disaccord by supposing that the א of the cited text had dropped out, having been omitted as a quiescent letter at the end of the syllable. Segert (no. 239) adheres to this position (v.i., under analysis of textual findings). This suggestion seems to have influenced Horst in the 1954 edition of his work to retract his emendation and to read ר'אשם. The reading ר'שמר of DSI[a] in Is. 24:6 for MT ר'אשמו would provide an exact parallel. However, the derivation from √שמם is also possible there, in agreement with T.

(3) Finally, it has been suggested that the word be derived from √שמם as in V et corruet, which implies the same reading as DSH.[9] Stonehouse[10] already anticipated this reading, suggesting either ר'יֻשַּׁם or ר'יֻשָּׁם. It will be seen from our exposition of ¶ 15 that the direct interpretation of the word in DSH is [לשחית את הארץ, which clearly implies the meaning "make desolate" from √שמם; so that whatever the orthographic origin of the reading without א, the derivation is not from √אשם in the sense "be guilty," in so far as the primary interpretation

---

8. See BASOR 112, n. 31, p. 17; 114, p. 9; DSS I, p. xx.
9. BA, XIV, 3, pp. 64 f., n. 35a; Molin, op. cit., p. 351.
10. Op. cit., pp. 135, 178.

of DSH is concerned. G. R. Driver[11] presents numerous examples of an apparent confusion of the roots אשם and שמם and builds upon them the theory that √שמם = √אשם, both being probably dialectical forms of √שמם. For this he could have cited Ezek. 6:6a תִּשָּׁמֵמְנָה, where Solomon Mandelkern[12] had already recognized that the vocalization in MT presupposes the √שׁמם. In this case, it would not really be a confusion to interpret MT √אשם in the sense of √שמם, as Driver notes. This affords an excellent explanation for the divergent orthographic readings of DSH and MT and brings them into agreement by relating both to the √שׁמם. In fact, if רֹאֵשֵׁם=רֹאֶשֶׁם here, there is not necessarily any variant as to tense or sense. The syntactical difficulty of the last clause is well explained by Stonehouse[13] as an example of casus pendens; but an appealing resolution of the metrical problem (in which the syntax would be altered) is the emendation of G. R. Driver,[14] wherein כחו is taken as late orthography for כחה, (cp. No. 26 below), an error in turn (by metathesis) for חכה. Driver translates: "And he is appalled who looketh (for help) to his god."

---

11. Occident and Orient, 1936, pp. 75-77.

12. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae Atque Chaldaicae, 1896, p. 1197, col. 1.

13. Op. cit., pp. 178 f.

14. JTS, 1938, p. 395.

25. זה iv.9 & 13; MT 1:11 זר . Substitution of the usual, late form for the earlier, poetic form. As Molin observes,[15] it is probably not original. Its sole support is Kenn. 1.

26. כוהר iv.9 & 13; MT 1:11 כחר. Scr. pl.; so also Kenn. 116.

27. לאלוהר (scr. pl.) iv.10 & 13; MT 1:11 לאלהר . It would be possible, as Elliger (p. 50) and Segert (No. 95) observe, to read לאלוהֵר, as from אלוה׳ם rather than אלוה; but there is no sufficient reason for opposing the MT, although אלה׳ר is supported by Kenn. primo 72, 91. The reading of DSH is found only in Kenn. 269. It is not impossible that DSH should be read לאלוה׳ in accord with G; for ר and ׳ are indistinguishable in this MS, and the commentary which would have made clear the interpretation in DSH is no longer extant. In any case, the Vorlage of G had only one letter after ה, as also MT and DSH.

28-29. The simplest treatment of וצור למוכ׳חר v.1 is to read in conformity with MT 1:12, taking למוכ׳חר as an Aramaized form of the infinitive replacing MT להוכ׳ח, as Yalon[16], followed by Habermann, does. If, with them and L. Rost[17] the suffix be treated also as an error, one ends with the MT. The suffix may be explained as a dittograph of the ׳ which begins

---

15. ThZ, '52, p. 351.

16. Kirjath Sepher, vol. 27, Nos. 2-3, 1951, p. 173b.

17. ThLZ, 1950, col. 479.

the next word; or it may be read as ' with Y. Ratzaby,[18] who takes it as a 1st person singular suffix, the antecedent being Israel. The commentary, however, makes it clear that God's people, the true Israel, is the chastizer of both Gentiles and apostate Jews. Since the pronominal suffix refers to the latter in the interpretation which here follows, it must certainly be read as the 3rd person. A reference to Israel as the chastizer depends upon the participial reading. Thus this widely divergent text is essential to the interpretation given in the document. The Syriac (cited below) evidently read the pronominal suffix with the infinitive. It achieved the same interpretation by the object "me"--"Thou hast formed me (עברתנ') to rebuke him."

It is clear to most translators that צור is no longer addressed to God as "Rock." According to Dupont-Sommer, J. van der Ploeg, Bo Reicke,[19] and G. Molin,[20] the passage is to be understood, "And as a rock to the one chastizing him hast thou ordained him." This is in accord with Aq., Symm., and V, where צור is seen as an accusative; but it finds Israel in the rock rather than in the chastizer. It is true that God's people suffer, as shown by the phrase בצר למו , v.6. The allusion in

---

18. JQR, xli, p. 157.

19. Handskrifterna från Qumran, p. 32.

20. ZKT, 1952, p. 59.

this phrase, however, is to ...לצור ל, and seems to indicate that the first word was read as a verb. It was suggested in BA 1951, p. 65, n. 36a, that the commentator construed the text as צור למוכיחו' literally, "it will be distressful to the one chastising him." Reading the verb, however, was probably no mere phantasy of DSH (as suggested there), but rested upon a tradition of interpretation. G certainly read a verb: καὶ ἔπλασέν με τοῦ ἐλέγχειν παιδείαν αὐτοῦ. The Vorlage would seem to have been somewhat as follows: להוכיח [? ורצני, or] ויצרני [? מוסרהו] יסרהו. The text is redundant; the Syriac reflects a simpler text, ורגבלהני למכסרותה "and thou hast formed me to rebuke him." For the derivation of the verb read by the Greek and Syriac, one has the choice of צור IV and צר' both of which mean "form, fashion." For the verb in DSH one has a choice between צור II, [צור] III, and צרר I & III, with common meanings such as "bind, besiege, show hostility, distress." It would appear best to derive the term from צור in both G and DSH; for this would yield a common term from which the divergent senses of fashion and distress were drawn. If one reads the infinitive, he may retain MT לצור but interpret it as a verb form. See further in commentary to ℣16.

The above is intended to show that the divergency of DSH is real, not to show its superiority. In favor of the MT is the closer parallelism of terms: לצור being parallel to יהוה' and להוכיח to למשפט, and the finite verbs standing in exact parallelism. MT is surely correct.

29a. עֵנִים v.1 (MT 1:13 עֵינַיִם) has been corrected by the insertion of the omitted י immediately above. The omission, however, confirms the pointing of MT with sere.

30. מראות בְּרָע v.2 and v.6 f; MT 1:13 מַרְאוֹת רָע. The first word is plene in accordance with MT, where however the ו is omitted by Kenn. 82. The reading of the second word with the preposition ב is attested by Kenn. 1, 4, 30, 72, 145, 150, 651; primo 176; nunc 224; Gins. 2, 26. Cf. also הרע Kenn. 172. With this medieval testimony, it is not at all surprising that it was "the reading of the famous medieval philosopher and poet Ibn Gabirol," as noted by M. H. Gottstein.[21] Rost[22] regards the preposition as a dogmatic correction intended to indicate a condemnation of evil, rather than a non-committal attitude. Segert, however, explains that ב "expresses the intensive inner participation in the thing seen."[23] The participation, contextually, would not be one of condemnation but one of seeming pleasure, esteem, sympathy, or at least toleration. The preposition is not improperly used, but the statement in MT--"too pure of eyes to look (at all, with or without sympathy) upon evil"--is stronger and may therefore be preferred. The insertion of ב is easier to explain than its omission. The

---

21. VT, II, 2, p. 187.

22. ThLZ, 1950, col. 479.

23. No. 187, citing Gesenius-Buhl, under ראה, Kal. 2.

omission is also superior on metrical grounds, as Elliger[24] observes.

31. והבט v.2 is either scr. def. (MT 1:13 והבט) or to be regarded as the inf. abs. (so Segert, Nos. 159-160). The defective spelling is supported only by Kenn. 158.

32. לוא (scr. pl.) v.2; MT 1:13 לא.

33. תביטו v.8; MT 1:13 תבט. The plural, in disagreement with the parallel והחרשתם, is clearly erroneous in Hab., but it is not an error in the text of DSH, where it gave rise to the interpretation that men rather than God are addressed. F. A. W. van 't Land and A. S. van der Woude (op. cit.) regard it as a scribal error in DSH, suggested by the anticipated interpretation. This seems to be an unlikely reversal of the true situation.[25]

33a. בוגדים v.8, scr. pl. as in MT 1:13, where however some MSS read בוגדים: Kenn. 2, 4, 23, 29, 30, 72, 94, 116, 126, 139, 141, 158, 159, 161, 172, 178, 182, 225, 228, 243, 258, 260, 264, 270; Gins. 7, 10, 13, 24, 26, 27, 34, 50, 68; edd. 1, 3, 10, 15.

34. והחרשתם v.8; MT 1:13 החרש. The conjunction is supported by T, S, V; its omission, by G.

---

24. Op. cit., p. 50.

25. Cp. exposition of commentary, ¶ 17; see also discussion below.

35. ותעש v.12; MT 1:14 ותעשה. The pointing of MT is that of the consecutive imperfect, in which the apocopated form of DSH would be more normal. As Segert (No. 243) notes, G and V translate with the future tense and therefore presumably read the unapocopated form of MT, construing the ו as only conjunctive. Many scholars had noted the inconsistency between the consonantal orthography of MT and its pointing of ו-consecutive.

36. למשל v.13 (MT 1:14 לא-משל) alters both sense and grammatical form, an infinitive doubtless replacing the participle. One may read Qal inf., defectively spelled, or as Segert (No. 244) suggests the Niph. inf. with syncopation of the ה after the preposition; as he notes, however, the Niph. is not attested in the OT in the sense "be ruled," but only in the sense "be compared." The text of MT, supported by all the versions, is parallel in thought to Prov. 6:7; whereas the text of DSH (as Rost, op. cit., col. 479, notes) expresses the thought of man's dominance over the creatures as set forth in Gen. 1:28. Elliger (op. cit., p. 51) asserts the metrical superiority of MT, and explains the omission of the א as due to the unusual grammatical form of the relative clause (citing Ges. Kautzsch[28], 152d), unless it was a scribal oversight in DSH. The commentary, though only partially preserved, does not support his view.

37. כולו v.13 is probably to be restored (cp iii.8); MT 1:15 כלה.[26] There is no visible trace of the last letter, so Habermann and van 't Land and van der Woude not unnaturally suggest כולה. The space limitations favor ו for the final letter, however, as does also the orthographic practice of DSH. Kenn. 112 witnesses כולה; whereas Kenn. 29, 141, 154 marg. 160 attest כלו.

38-39. יעלה ו׳גרהו v.13; MT 1:15 העלה ׳גרהו. The juxtaposition of the perfect and imperfect tenses in MT is patently wrong and has been emended by critics in line with the versions, where both verbs have the same tense (G aorist, V perfect, T and S participle). G and V favor Heb. perfects, and their translation of the previous imperfects in verses 13 and 14 makes this inference secure. S and T (?) seem to have rendered imperfects, S (which attests the conjunction) reading ו-conjunctive; and this seems to be confirmed by their use of the participle for the imperfects of verse 13 and of the perfect for the consecutive imperfect of verse 14. G and S attest the conjunction, whereas T and V do not, so that we seem to arrive at four different Heb. prototypes: העלה ו׳גרהו (G), העלה גררהו (V), יעלה ו׳גרהו (S), ׳עלה ׳גרהו (T?). Since DSH is precisely in line with S alone, it is impossible to decide on this basis which reading is correct; in any case a version is

---

26. So Segert (Nos. 86-87) and Elliger (op. cit., p. 35).

not a sure guide as to the presence of a conjunction. Segert (Nos. 245-246) notes in regard to the first verb that ה and י might be confused in the Old Hebrew (or Canaanite) alphabet, and in regard to the second verb that the presence or absence of the conjunction in a script like that of DSH may be attributed to dittography or haplography of the ambiguous ו/י. Since DSH, as against MT, does not require emendation and fits excellently in the connection, it is certainly to be preferred to MT. It may or may not be original; the versions sometimes attest a differing text, but it is safer to trust a Hebrew text than the hypothetical Vorlage of a version. DSH would seem to confirm, therefore, the emendations of Buhl and Horst according to the Syriac.[27]

39a. ו'גרהו v.13, scr. def. So MT, but some MSS have scr. pl., ו'גרהו: Kenn. 112, 154, 161, 168, 172, 178, 258; primo 89.

40. ו'ספהו v.14; MT 1:15 ו'אספהו. Either this is a phonological and orthographic variant or the copyist had in mind a אסף=יסף. Of these two alternatives, posed by van der Ploeg (op. cit., p. 36), it is the first which Molin (ThZ, 1952, p. 352), Elliger (op. cit., p. 51), Segert (No. 67), and Habermann consider. It is favored by ו'רכיפו vi.1, where ו represents ō and the quiescent א is omitted.

---

27. In the 1954 edition of Handbuch zum Alten Testament Horst cites the authority of DSH.

41. As the text of v.14 f. is certainly to be restored, the final clause of MT 1:15 and the initial clause of 1:16 are transposed: ר'ג'ל ׳שמח כן עד (15) להרמר ׳וב]ח [על כן (16) ר'קטר למכמרתו[(16). The order of MT, however, is supported by the brief second citation, where the first clause is followed immediately by ר'קטר למכמרתו (vi.2 f.). The variation in order in the lengthier citation could be explained as occasioned by an accidental omission of the first clause, the eye jumping to the second occurrence of על כן; the scribe then, perhaps, noted the omission and inserted it, regarding the order as of no serious importance. Two manuscripts of the Lucianic recension of G reveal the same sort of transcriptional errors: the first of the clauses having been omitted in $\mathfrak{L}$I (according to Ziegler's designation), a manuscript dated to the 11th-12th centuries A.D., but appearing after the second clause in $\mathfrak{L}$II, a MS dated to the 9th-14th centuries.[28] Just as in $\mathfrak{L}$I the first two clauses of verse 16 are linked in proper sequence, according to MT, so likewise are they in the second citation of DSH vi.2 f.--supporting in each case the order of the MT.[29]

42. כ'א vi.5 (metathetic א); MT 1:16 כ'.

---

28. I am dependent here upon Segert No. 247.

29. Bo Reicke (op. cit., p. 33, n. 28) holds that the order in DSH is natural, but he seems to have misunderstood the evidence of G, where he supposes the clause to be missing.

43. בהם vi.5; MT 1:16 בהמה.

44. ברי=ברי׳א vi.5; MT 1:16 בראה. Grammatically the reading of DSH is superior, presenting a masculine adjective in agreement with the noun מאכל. The ה in MT perhaps arose from a dittograph of the first letter of the next word (העל, verse 17). Kennicott and Ginsburg do not attest the masculine form. Kenn. 251 reads curiously ברי׳ה, which does not alter the gender. Cp. Ez. 34:20. The orthography of DSH is scr. pl., but with a characteristic omission of quiescent א. The form בר׳אה is attested by Kenn. 2, 3, 29, 30, 72, 89, 91, 96, 112, 116, 126, 139, 150, 176, 182, 206, 210, 224, 227, 252, 253, 258, 260, 264, 269, 271 A; primo 141; Gins. 7, 10, 11, 21, 26, 27, 34, 40, 68, 69; edd. 1, 4, 10, 12, 13. Duhm had altered the noun into a feminine מאכלתו (after מכלת, I Kings 5:25) a word which is attested in the Talmud, but in the sense of "louse," "wood worm," though its Syriac counterpart מאכולתה bears the meaning "food" which is required by the present passage. Segert (No. 247) suggests that the pre-Masoretic text contained a feminine form of the noun with a feminine adjective, and that then the noun was altered to the masculine (or perhaps better, replaced by an original masculine), with the adjective left as feminine. Whether or not this was precisely the process, it seems probable that MT should be interpreted as a mixed reading, bearing witness to both feminine and masculine forms of the text.

45. על כן vi.8; MT 1:17 העל כן, with ה-interrogative. The fact that de Rossi primo 226 also omitted the interrogative is

probably of no significance. Of the versions only T attests the interrogative, so that Procksch (BH$^{3-7}$) already favored its deletion. Ed Nielsen (STh, VI, fasc. 1, p. 71, n. 3) explains the ה of MT as dittography of the preceding word בראה; so also Segert (Nos. 248-249). In this case the feminine form of that word (see above, No. 44) cannot be explained by dittography of the ה here. In the Greek recension newly discovered in Palestine[30] one finds ει δια του in place of G διὰ τοῦτο, attesting presumably the interrogative particle of MT. Since palaeographically this document has been dated by C. H. Roberts between 50 B.C. and 50 A.D.,[31] both the feminine reading at the end of MT 1:16 and its "dittograph" as the following interrogative would have to be very ancient. G. Molin (ThZ, 1952, p. 352) and Elliger (op. cit., p. 52) regard the reading of DSH as superior. Rost (ThLZ, 1950, col. 480) thinks that even without the particle of interrogation the verse should be understood as a question.

46. The object of the verb ירק (vi.8) is חרבו; for MT 1:17 it is חרמו. Van der Ploeg (op. cit., p. 3a) and Segert (No. 250) find as the only versional support of this new Hebrew reading the Coptic Bohairic version and a marginal reading in one Greek codex (Minuscule 86) of the Lucian recension. In view of the allegorical interpretation in T, one cannot be sure of its

---

30. Barthélemy, RB, LX, 1953, pp. 18 ff.

31. Cited with approval by P. Kahle, ThLZ, 1954, Nr. 2, col. 81.

reading. In the extant copies of T the equivalent of MT הרמו in 1:16 is זי'נ'ה (his weapons); but in 1:17, מט'ר'י'ת'ה (his troops). T's different renderings do not necessarily point to different Heb. nouns, for its choice of translations was also determined by the verbs "sacrifice" and "draw" ("send" in T). Moreover, since DSH, in dependence upon T, inverts the equations in 1:16, it is possible that the most primitive form of text equated לחרמו in 1:16 with לס'מאות'ה (standards), which may designate military divisions. In that case we would have a closely synonymous translation, "standards" paralleling "troops," with a noun in each case suitable to the context. This would strengthen the possibility that T was in agreement with MT, but the uncertainties are too great for T to be counted either way. In the newly found G recension, however, we find DSH supported by a version roughly contemporary with DSH. Giesebrecht, followed enthusiastically by Wellhausen, had long ago made this emendation. Most interpreters, however, have objected to the sudden change of figure in 1:17 produced by this reading. Molin even suggests that the author of DSH deliberately altered the text in order to support his interpretation, which is dependent upon his reading. In view of the testimony of the newly found Greek recension, this charge cannot be accepted. Dupont-Sommer, on the other hand, argues that the reading is "incontestablement préférable; elle donne raison aux critiques, assez nombreux, qui avaient proposé la même correction."[32] He

---

32. Op. cit., p. 144.

appropriately stresses the similarity between ב and מ in the script of the DSH which would contribute to the scribal error. This confusion would be all the easier in view of the previous mention of חרם. Segert argues that since the figure of fishing is no longer present in verse 17b, where the slaughter of nations occurs, this may well be true of the original text of 17a, for these are but two halves of the same poetic line. Elliger (op. cit., p. 52) states that the originality of the expression in MT favors it against the usual connection with חרב. Cp. Ex. 15:19; Lev. 26:33; Ez. 5:2, 12; 12:14; 28:7; 30:11; Ps. 35:3. However, he believes that the balance of probability tips in favor of DSH. Horst, who had previously read with the MT, now reads with DSH. With these conclusions of Dupont-Sommer, Elliger, Horst and Segert, one heartily agrees.

47, 49. ולוא יחמל .. תמיד להרוג .. יריק vi.8 f. The different placement of ו in DSH presents a different syntax from that of MT 1:17 לא יחמול .. ותמיד להרוג .. יריק . This variant is supported in full by T, and perhaps by S where the conjunctions are placed precisely the same, though S may have read a participle rather than the infinitive. The reading of MT is supported fully by G and V, and likewise by the newly discovered recension of G?[33] There is some slight Heb. MS support for ולא: Kenn. 201, 224; primo 130. According to Segert (Nos. 251-

33. Barthélemy, op. cit., Pl. I, lines 10 f., facing p. 24.

a few Greek MSS (including cod. Venetus) omit καί. They thus contain a Greek text which attests the conjunction in neither place, a text which Elliger (op. cit., p. 52) prefers on metrical grounds.

The Massoretic punctuation (by its placement of the 'athnah and mer^{e}kha) has joined ותמ׳ר with what follows rather than with what precedes. This throws the sentence metrically off balance. Most modern expositors have therefore deleted the ו and have interpreted לא ׳תמר as a circumstantial clause. The latter point is certainly correct, and Wellhausen (who did not delete ו) so interpreted the clause. It is possible, however, to understand the ו as explicative and to include MT ותמ׳ר (in opposition to MT punctuation) within the first stichos of the verse. The structural difference between MT and DSH then becomes a matter of differently placed emphasis, as brought out by the different location of the ו:

MT Shall he therefore draw his net, and that continually, to slay nations without showing pity?

DSH He shall therefore draw his sword continually, to slay nations, and that without showing pity.

The metrical argument is thus largely invalidated for determining the superior text. It is not clear that the easier construction of MT is inferior.[34] One might explain the

---

34. In fact Elliger (op. cit., p. 52) objects to the ו before לוא in DSH on rhythmic grounds; and it is true that the word would be more likely to receive a separate beat when combined with the ו than otherwise. In view of the elasticity of Hebrew metrics and the irregularity with which much of its poetry is characterized, the rhythmic argument is not conclusive.

presence or absence of the ו before תמי׳ר in MT as being a matter of either dittography or haplography of the preceding ו of תרמר (or תרבו). The addition or omission of the ו before לא could be a memoriter error, or even interpretative in origin. It is noteworthy that the interpretation found in DSH is closely linked with the added emphasis given the last clause by the conjunction before it.

48. להרוג vi.9; MT 1:17 להרג. The scr. pl. is attested by Kenn. 17, 91, 112, 161, 253, 258, 260, 269, 271 A; Gins. 11, 26, 34, 40, 58, 69; edd. 1, 3, 10, 12, 13.

49. (See No. 47)

50. יחמל׳ vi.9; MT 1:17 יחמול׳. Scr. def. also Kenn. 1, 3, 4, 17, 29, 30, 72, 82, 89, 91, 93, 94, 96, 113, 116, 126, 139, 150, 158, 159, 160, 172, 178, 182, 195, 224, 243, 252, 258, 288, 601, 602; primo 141; Gins. 3, 7, 10, 26, 27, 34, 37, 40, 50, 57, 65, 68; edd. 1, 6.

51. אעמודה vi.12; MT 2:1 אעמדה. Scr. pl. also Kenn. 112, 283.

52. מצורי׳ vi.13; MT 2:1 מצור. The sole support for DSH is T, where the first person pronominal suffix is supported by both variants: מצורתי׳ (Cod. Reuchlin) and מצורתי׳ (usual edition). The other versions support the omission of the suffix, including the newly found recension of G. Wellhausen noted that stylistically one would expect either the article or the pronominal suffix. The parallelism with the preceding משמרתי׳ has led most

critics (Duhm, Lachmann, Horst, Kittel, Robinson, Marti) to favor the reading with the pronominal suffix. F. Horst brought forward the ו of the following word and read it as י. But DSH reads both letters, suggesting rather the disappearance of the י through haplography with the following ו from which it may not have been distinguishable. The reading of DSH is stylistically better; that of MT is better supported. Elliger (op. cit., p. 52) and Molin (ThZ, 1952, p. 353) prefer the reading of DSH.

52a. לראות vi.13 scr. pl.; so MT, but cp. Kenn. 89 לראת.

52b. תוכחתי vi.14 scr. pl.; so MT, but cp. Kenn. 126, 178 תכחתי.

52c. ריעניני vi.14; so MT 2:2, but Kenn. 1, 258 ריעניני. (scr. pl.).

53. הלרחות vi.15; MT 2:2 הלחות. Scr. pl. as in DSH also Kenn. 1, 72, 93, 96, 112, 113, 178, 226, 228, 250; cp. the completely defective חלחת Kenn. 23, 30, 91, 172, 173, 176, 242, 245, 249, 258, 260, 264, and scr. pl. for the first vowel only חלרחת, Kenn. 4, 17, 150, 224.

54. הקורא in the extant (second) citation vii.3; MT 2:2 קורא (anarthrous). Both have scr. pl.; contrast the scr. def. of Kenn. 17, 23, 30, 89, 94, 102, 116, 126, 154, 178, 225, 227, 283; Gins. 2, 3, 10, 13, 27, 50, 68. The reading כל קורא, Kenn. 168, 250, contrasts sharply with the specific interpretation in DSH, based upon the reading with the article. G reads

ὁ ἀναγινώσκων, but the Palestinian recension attests the anarthrous reading.[35] Elliger (op. cit., p. 52) is inclined to prefer the reading of DSH.

55. כ'א vii.5; MT 2:3a כ'. Cf. no. 5.

56. פ'ח' vii.6 (presumably, though פרח' is possible); MT 2:3 ר'פח. For scr. pl., cf. ר'פ'ח Kenn. 17, 96. Molin, probably assuming a derivation from √פחח on the basis of the sere in MT, interprets the ' inserted in DSH as an error, though he thinks it may indicate the Hiph. of √פרח , in which case he would postulate a conscious emendation in DSH. But in either spelling, even with MT vocalization, the word is probably from √פרח .[36] Conscious emendation is improbable also in view of the scr. pl. of Kenn. 17 and 96. G καὶ ἀνατελεῖ implies either ר'פרח or רפרח . With the latter compare רפוח , a possible reading of DSH. Thus either G indirectly supports the scr. pl. of DSH, which was misread, or DSH indirectly supports G. The Palestinian recension reads και ενφανησε[ται] in agreement with V apparebit, and also with the Coptic.[37] The Vorlage for this may have been ר'פ'ע , as proposed by Lachmann. Cp. Segert (Nos. 254-255). The DSS afford many examples of confusion of the gutterals on

---

35. Barthélemy, op. cit., Pl. I, line 17.

36. Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, no. 72, dd.

37. Cf. Barthélemy, op. cit., p. 27.

phonetic grounds. Although the versions may be adduced in support of emendation, the reading of MT is satisfactory (cp. Paul Humbert, Problèmes du Livre d'Habacuc, 1944, pp. 146 f.), and it is now reinforced by DSH, with the exception of the conjunction. The loss or addition of ו before י can (in the script of the scroll) be explained as due to haplography or dittography, respectively. One may agree with Elliger (op. cit., p. 52) that the omission in DSH is helpful metrically.

57. ולוא appears at vii.6 for MT 2:3a ולא, where the MS evidence is unanimous for the scr. def., but several MSS omit the conjunction: Kenn. 23, 91, 93, 116, 141, 155, 160, 195, 201, 224, 243, 269, 601.

57a. DSH reads בזוד יי at vii.6 in agreement with MT 2:3a, where, however, Kenn. 96 reads בזיד יי.

58. כיא, with metathetic א, appears at vii.9 for MT 2:3b כי.

59-60. יבוא בוא appears plene at vii.9 for MT 2:3b יבא בא. The plene script of both words is attested by Kenn. 17, 93, 102, 154; that of the first word alone, by Kenn. 112, 182; that of the second word alone, by Kenn. 23, 155, 158, 245.

61. ולוא appears at vii.9 for MT 2:3b לא. The conjunction is witnessed by ולא in many MSS: Kenn. 1, 4, 17, 30, 72, 89, 126, 139, 145, 150, 155, 160, 178, 180, 182, 224, 246, 249, 250, 258, 260, 264, 271 A, 288, 300, 601; primo 128, 130, forte 154,

nunc 2; Gins. 5, 7, 10, 11, 24, 26, 52, 69, ed. 1, ed. 3, ed. 6, ed. 10; de Rossi 4, 24, 26, 196, 226, 305, 341, 346, 380, 440, 545, 560, 663, 715, 789; primo 2, 187, 579, nunc 20, 554. It is the reading also in the following incunabula listed by de Rossi: Biblia Soncinensia, Brixiensia, Antiqua sine anno, Veneta 1518 ad marg, Prophetae Soncinenses. Segert cites also the first edition of Biblia Rabbinica (1517) (= Gins. ed. 13 not cited above). The codices of Leningrad and Aleppo are among the majority of MSS reading לא. The conjunction was read presumably by the versions: T, S, G, Aq., V, Arab.; cf. the quotation in Ep. Heb. 10:37. The ancient external evidence thus overwhelmingly supports DSH. Elliger, op. cit., p. 52, believes the ו to be metrically desirable.

61a. הנה at vii.14 is in agreement with MT 2:4 against והנה, attested by Kenn. 474, 494.

62. עפלה at vii.14 confirms both text and vocalization of MT 2:4 עפלה. The plene script is found elsewhere only in Kenn. 112. Michaelis (Biblioth. Or., T. xxii, I, p. 170) inferred from Kenn. 327 עפלו that the ה is the pronominal suffix; but the vocalization of DSH in its coincidence with MT is against this. The versions seem to have read quite differently. G's rendering ὑποστείληται, Aq's νωχεκευομένου, and the Palestinian recension's ...[σ]κοτια all seem to be based upon √עלף, which in the Pu'al means "be covered, obscured, swoon." T is too paraphrastic to be of assistance here, nor can one be sure of

the Vorlage of the Latin; but in both is the thought of unbelief read into the verb, an interpretation which could rest upon √עלף taken to refer to a giving-up in despair through insufficient faith in the promises of God. Kenn. 461 reads עולפה and Kenn. primo 531 עלפה in probable agreement with the versions. G. R. Driver, however, suggests that the Vorlage of Aq. and V was העפל, which after the Arabic غَفَلَ he interprets to mean "the heedless man."

63. לוא appears at vii.14 for MT 2:4 לא. The plene script is is unattested. The reading ולא is witnessed by Kenn. 150, 155, 309.

64. ורוה' at vii.14 for MT 2:4 ישרה' implies yušᵉrah (Puʿal perf. of √ישר') for MT Qal perf. yašᵉrah. The Puʿal perf. of DSH is commended by its identity of form with the parallel term עופלה . Parallelism excludes the reading of DSH as a Qal ptc.

64a. Instead of באמונתו in Hab. 2:4, G, Aq., and Old Latin read באמונה' . It is no loss that the word in vii.15 is no longer extant, for in the script of the scroll ו and ' could not have been distinguished. The interpretation אמנתם ("their faith") at viii.2, however, fortunately confirms the 3rd per. suffix. T's קושטהון interprets also the 3rd sing. suffix--the plural number being merely a part of the translator's free representation of the thought. The Palestinian recension reads εν πιστ[ε]ι αυτου with MT against G's ἐκ πιστεώς μου, as

noted by Barthélemy, op. cit., p. 24. In the N. T. neither suffix is attested (Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11; Heb. 10:38), but the interpretation is consonant with the 3rd pers. Cp. here Kenn. באמונת 475.

65. כ'א at viii.3 for MT 2:5 כי is characteristic.

66-67. הון יבגוד (or הון יבגיד) at vii.3 is a radical departure from MT 2:5 ה''ן בגד.[38] G rendered κατοιώμενος καὶ καταφρονήτης The Old Latin follows closely: Ille vero qui praesumit et contumax est. Already in 1885, Houtsma clarified the first term of G as a noun derived from the verbal root הון or ה'ן, which appears as a hapax legomenon in Deut. 1:41, where והתה'נו is employed as the equivalent of ר'עפלו of Num. 14:44.[39] Since the latter root occurs in MT 2:4, the former would seem to be used appropriately in verse 5. The noun would be either hawwān or hayyān, in either case a noun of the qattāl form like qannâ' or dayyān. In this he was followed by H. Ooort, G. Smit and

---

38. For the divergent spelling בוגד, cf. the introduction, p. 4, n. 2. Both Kenn. and Gins. read plene. They list the following defective MSS: Kenn. 1, 3, 23, 29, 30, 72, 99, 100, 102, 116, 159, 161, 168, 175, 176, 195, 210, 246, 250, 300 T.; Gins. 2, 11, 13, 15, 16, 22, 34, 36, 40, 42, 43, 49, 50, 65, 68, ed

39. M. Th. Houtsma, "Habakuk 2:4 en 5," Theol. Tijdschrift, 1885, pp. 180-183. C. Rabin (Vetus Testamentum, vol. V, no. 2, p. 153) would emend Hab. 2:5 so as to read]'חח. William Creighton Graham, "A Note on Habakkuk 2:4-5," AJSLL, 42, pp. 128 f has expressed the need for a verb here. His particular suggestion, however, is invalidated by the fact that אף כי means "much less" only in a negative sentence.

K. Marti.[40] The commentary in DSH took the term to mean wealth, implying hôn. Yet the consonantal reading tends to confirm Houtsma's theory. Instead of κατοιδύενος, Rahlfs and Ziegler have adopted Schleusner's conjectural reading κατοινώμενος in agreement with MT; but, as Segert (Nos. 257-258) has observed, it supposes that the Heb. יין (wine) was mistranslated. Moreover the extant text of G, according to Segert, affords a pair of excellent antitheses: "der sich herabsetzende" and "der die anderen herabsetzende." He further notices that G seems to have read רבגד, where DSH reads ר(ו)בג'; but in a script where ו and ' are ambiguous. This brings the texts of G and DSH very close together; but it leaves unresolved what G read for the preceding words ואף כי, which seem inadequately represented by ὁ δέ.

The paraphrastic renderings of T and V suggest a Vorlage in approximate agreement with MT. T renders כטעי בחמר גבר יהיר כרשע, "Like him who stumbles through wine is the haughty man in wickedness." V renders et quomodo vinum potantem decipit, sic erit vir superbus, "And as wine deceives the drinker, so will a proud man be." As Segert perceives decipit could represent the participle בגד in MT, but its grammatical structure suits even better the imperfect form of DSH. The rendering of S appears similar to G: ורגברא מרהא ר'ענא, "the audacious and greedy man."

---

40. H. Oort is cited by Karl Marti, op. cit. G. Smit's valuable commentary is entitled De Prophetie van Habakuk, Utrecht, 1900.

The reading hawwān (presumptuous) would provide us with a personal reference in the place of "wine" or "wealth." C. C. Torrey proposed reading הי֫וני בגד, "the Greek is treacherous." One can see how such a reading could have through wrong word division become היון ׳בגד, in which case the MT would preserve best the first word and DSH would preserve accurately the second. One could further explain the omission of a letter (ו or ׳) in the first word as due to haplography (cf. van der Ploeg, op. cit., p. 3, col. 1), or even as due to dialectical variation, inasmuch as the Samaritan ostraka witness the form ׳ו (cp. Rost, ThLz, 1950, col. 480, n. 1). Such an interpretation, however, would require emending the "Chaldaeans" of Hab. 1:6 to "Kittim"; and for this DSH lends no textual support. Wellhausen achieved a personal reference by conjecturing that the first of the "Woes" began with this verse; and thus he found a personal reference in הוי בוגד, "Wehe dem Räuber." Procksch builds upon these suggestions by proposing either הוי הי֫וני בגד, or הוי הי֫ונה בגד. Elliger (op. cit., p. 53) thinks that the reading of but three letters in DSH makes probable the emendation הוי. The general assumption that בגד means "act treacherously" here, in the absolute sense, yields the unintelligible statement of the American Standard Version (and of other versions): "wine is treacherous, a haughty man, that keepeth not at home." The Authorized Version with a more doubtful construction of the text achieved a personal reference by rendering: "Yea also, because he transgresseth by wine, he is a proud man." (Italics my own.)

The Revised Standard Version rightly notes the obscurity of the Hebrew. If expositors are correct in the necessity of a personal reference here, the text of DSH can point the way to a reading between MT and G:

> The presumptuous man, moreover, is treacherous,
> a haughty man, and one that keepeth not at home.

W. F. Albright has suggested to me the emended reading and translation:

ואף כי יִבְגֹּד פֶּהָיָן גבר יהי[ר ו]לא ינוה

> And even though he be tricky as Hayyan (Hiyyon);
> the presumptuous man will not succeed.

In the Ugaritic epics the name HYN (Hayyan) appears as a synonym of KTR. Its probable derivation from HYN links this figure with the Mediterranean Hermes, the crafty inventor of legend. This suggestion is apposite, since the immediate context refers to an insatiableness "as Sheol" and "as Death (or Mot)," with the overtones of Canaanite mythology. For the meaning of the verb yinwêh, he cites the Greek περάνη. Cf. BASOR, No. 91 (1943), p. 40, n. 11.

If, however, one may relate הוֹן or הַיָּיִן with בגד in an accusative relationship, the seeming unintelligibility of the Heb. can be overcome; but Psalm 73:15 is the only other example of this construction. With "wine" (or "wealth") as the subject an appropriate meaning for the verb would be "deceive." Cf. V decipit and Luther's rendering: "Wein betrügt den stolzen Mann." G. Molin translates similarly; and in view of the greater propriety of a reference to wealth, rather than wine, he declares that one would assume that the MT is corrupted from the text in DSH, if it were not that the reading of the latter has a definite sectarian flavor. Consequently he concludes contrariwise that

DSH presents a deliberate corruption of the MT. Another possibility is that one should read Hiph'il, בגד, "cause to be treacherous." Such would seem to be the implied reading of A. Dupont-Sommer: "les richesses amèneront l'homme orgueilleux a trahir." This construction (Molin to the contrary) would agree closely with the interpretation of the commentary. The Hiph'il, however, is unattested elsewhere.

The text is extremely difficult whether one reads with MT or DSH, but whatever approach one takes to the passage he finds a possible advantage in DSH. Therefore, some possible construction of the text of the latter may be correct. Probably one should vocalize the word as hawwān (or hayyān), rather than follow the sectarian interpretation of the word as hôn. Albright's present reconstruction, based partly upon the Scroll text, is attractive.

68. ולוא יגוה viii, 3 f.;MT 2:5 ולא יגוה. Van 't Land and van der Woude read יגוה in conformity with Humbert's emendation. Their reading is based, however, upon the false assumption that ה and ח are indistinguishable. True there is not any gap, or opening at the upper left as in our printed manuscripts in the representation of the ה ; but the letters are nevertheless distinguishable, the top of the ה being written with a knotted loop at the upper left, whereas the left stroke of the ח rises vertically for a short distance above the cross bar. Therefore the only variant here is the plene spelling of ולוא. It is noteworthy that the conjunction ו is witnessed by DSH against

S, G, and G cod. 86; Kenn. 1, 30, 116, 154, 155, 168, 201, 224. Cf. לא # in Kenn. 82. T, V, MT, and the newly found Palestinian recension of G (Barthelemy, op. cit., Pl. I, 4th line from bottom) support DSH. An odd reading of Kenn. 150 is ינרך, which phonetically could equal ינרת .

69. לוא ישבע appears at viii.4 for MT 2:5 ולא ישבע, a reading which in its defective form לא is attested by Kenn. 154, Gins. 2, 3, 15, 21. G, T, and S have the conjunction here; whereas G even in the Palestinian recension omits it, but Segert (no. 193) thinks that the participial construction of G implies it. In MT והוא כמות is a nominal clause, and it is followed by a circumstantial verbal clause: "He is as death, without satisfaction." Segert observes that the same translation is possible for the new reading, though it also becomes possible for the verb ישבע to receive הוא as its subject, and for כמות to become adverbial. The latter certainly would be the more natural construction. The ו of MT may have arisen, however, as a guarantee that the text should be construed nominally, i.e., as an aid in sentence punctuation in the pre-Masoretic period.[41] Elliger (loc. cit.) regards the reading of DSH as scarcely better than that of MT.

70, 73. וי׳אספו אלו כול הגוים ויקבצו אלו כול העמים viii.5; MT 2:5 .....ויקבץ.....ויאסף--with the plural Niphʿal

---

41. In my opinion, many additional ו's in DSI[a] are so to be interpreted.

replacing the Qal singular, and with a resultant change of subjects. Segert (nos. 259-260) notes that one ought not accept the consecutive imperfect vocalization of MT as authoritative, inasmuch as only T and S render with perfects, whereas G and V employ the future tense. Contextually the imperfect with simple ו is preferable. One will readily agree with Elliger (loc. cit.) and Segert that the sense is less satisfying than the reading of MT which is attested by all the versions. It can possibly be explained as a memoriter error; but perhaps the last two letters of each word in a plene text were accidentally transposed--more probably of one only by accident, the other representing a wrong correction consequent upon it. The text was not altered for sake of interpretation, for the commentary at viii.11 employs וי֫קבוץ which as a consecutive imperfect agrees with MT. However, the reading of 2:5 in DSH, by eliminating a change of subject in 2:6 produces an easier construction. Cf. No. 76.

71, 74. At viii.5 we read the defective אלו for both occurrences of MT 2:5 אלי֫ו.

72, 75. כול appears at viii.5 for both occurrences of the defectively written MT 2:5 כל.

75a. הלוא appears plene at viii.6 in agreement with MT 2:6, where, however, many MSS read defectiva הלא: Kenn. 1, 2, 4, 17, 24, 29, 30, 72, 89, 91, 93, 96, 102, 116, 126, 128, 141, 150,

154, 161, 168, 172, 176, 178, 224, 242, 249, 250, 252, 253, 258, 260, 264; primo 82; Gins. 2, 3, 7, 10, 13, 15, 24, 27, 34, 37, 40, 42, 50, 58, 69; edd. 1, 3, 10.

76. From the phrase הלוא-אלה כלם of MT 2:6, DSH viii.6 omits the demonstrative pronoun אלה, which (as Segert noted, under his no. 261) served to facilitate the understanding by underscoring the change of subject. Since this subject change has already occurred in the preceding verse, as quoted in DSH (see above under Nos. 70, 73), its text may well dispense with אלה. It is noteworthy that both verses are cited in sequence, with no intervening commentary, so that the smoother connection between makes itself felt even in the present document. The reading of DSH has against it the weight of all the versions which translate the demonstrative pronoun. However, the reading of the MT is overburdened metrically, so that Procksch (BH$^{3-7}$) deletes עליו which follows immediately the words cited here. To do so, however, is to impair the completeness of the parallelism with the next stichos, so that one does well to consider the rightness of the omission in DSH. It seems probable to the present writer that at this point DSH yields the more primitive reading and that אלה entered the MT (or its forebear) as a helpful gloss, facilitating the change of subject, and that a similar but smoother result was achieved in the text of DSH by introducing the subject change earlier. In a text in which 2:5c was like the MT and 2:6a like DSH, the change of subject would have

been more subtly indicated by the change of number alone. The Chaldaeans as a single nation (1:6) have been constantly referred to in the singular number, but now after the mention of "nations" and "peoples" the plural appears with reference to them. It is also possible that dittography played a part in producing in the MT the similarly appearing words הלא אלה. Note that one is just the reverse of the other, and that furthermore ה and א are frequently miswritten for one another in the DSS. Of course, haplography might explain the text in DSH, as Elliger (op. cit., p. 53) and Segert suggest; but the metrical argument would favor dittography. Elliger, who regards the sentence as redactional, is not concerned with poetic quality at this point.[42]

77. כולם viii.6; MT 2:6 כלם. The plene script is attested only by Kenn. 224.

78. משל עלי[ו] ישאו viii.6; MT 2:6 עליו משל ישאו. An uncertain value is to be placed upon the word order of versions, in which the sequence may be influenced by the idiom of the language of translation, or even by the literary style of the translator. Nevertheless, one may observe (after Segert No. 262) that the word order of DSH is in agreement with most witnesses of G,

---

42. Segert (nos. 294-295) scans 2:6a in MT as 6/4 and in DSH as 5/4. where greater regularity is thereby approached. But he assigns a separate beat to הלא, which may readily be combined accentually with the following word.

whereas the order of MT is possibly reflected by T, V, and some Greek MSS (46, catenae) and Codex Syrohexaplaris. A third group of witnesses (S and the Greek Codex Venetus) might conceivably attest the order משל ישׂא עלי׳ו. Procksch (BH$^{3-7}$) suggests still a fourth arrangement ישׂא משל [עלי׳ו]. Verbal sequence can only be really assured on the basis of Heb. MSS. One must therefore choose between DSH and MT. The order of DSH is more natural and less awkward than that of MT which led Procksch to what is probably the wrong emendation. Whichever way the error may be, it is a simple matter of transposition.

79. רמלי׳צי (or רמלי׳צו) viii.6; MT 2:6 רמלי׳צה. Rost (ThLZ, 1950, col. 480) has posed the alternatives as a choice between the construct state, plural in number, of a noun not otherwise attested, or of a Hiph'il participle of לי׳ץ. The Heb. noun מלי׳צה occurs rarely and apart from Hab. 2:6 would be a hapax legomenon, so that the supposition of a masculine noun מלוץ, after the analogy of מלון (f. מלונה) from לי׳ן or לון, etc., does not seem impossible. Such was the assumption of the first translation (BASOR 112, p. 13). The second alternative (that of the Hiph'il participle) is more convincing, however, because one finds himself on well attested ground. One of the sect's hymns contains the phrase רמלי׳צי רמיה (Meg. Gen. II, Pl. ix, li. 3). Therefore this was followed in BA XIV.3, p. 67. This interpretation was first presented by Dupont-Sommer, and has been followed by all translators since him, but with various senses,

as to whether the verb is to be derived from √לוץ I, "to scorn," or √לוץ II, "to interpret."[43]

Segert (no. 99) suggests that the last letter be read as ו and be read as the 3rd masc. sing. suffix to the plural participle defectively written (מלי׳צ׳ו=מליצו). The versions seem to presuppose מליצה, the construct, which is grammatically easier. Segert explains that in the plene script ו׳ might have become confused with ה (giving rise to the MT), or with ת (giving rise to the presumed Vorlage of the versions). By emending ו׳רמרו of DSH to א׳מרו=׳רמרו, he would provide the clause with a verb and improve the parallelism, thus:

> Shall not they all take up a parable against him?
> And his scorners speak riddles with regard to him?

Not resting content with this suggestion, he proposes also another, whereby he would emend the present variant to read והליצו. The ה, as he explains, could readily be confused with ם under certain conditions in a script like DSH. In this case the second stich would become: "and interpret riddles with regard to him, and say." That a verb was desired here was long felt, and some critics have followed Wellhausen in seeking it in the form א׳מרו from MT ו׳אמר. Stonehouse looked with

---

43. Perhaps the original and basic meaning of the root is "to talk freely, to babble," as proposed by Maurice A. Canney, "The Hebrew מל׳ץ," AJSL, Jan., 1924, pp. 134 f. Cf. also H. N. Richardson, "Some notes on לוץ and its derivates," VT V.2 (April 1955), pp. 163-179.

suspicion upon the two nouns of similar import; he suggested that the verb was to be sought in the second and that perhaps תידות should be replaced by יתודו--but with some misgivings. The emendation of Segert which would alter but a single letter of the first word as preserved in DSH would be much simpler, and it might conceivably be correct. On the other hand, the text of DSH as it stands gives an acceptable sense, if we interpret it in the manner of Segert. But if one reads the plural construct, "interpreters of riddles," the parallelism is worse than in the MT. Therefore one would certainly judge MT to be superior, regarding one of the two nouns in MT as an appositional gloss to the other, the force of the first verb being carried forward to the next stichos, thus:

> Shall they not all compose a parable against him,
> even a satire (riddles) with regard to him, saying: . . .

Thus there are two opposite points of view that seem equally tenable, one that the text of DSH is superior and through emendation may be brought to perfection, the other that it is inferior to the glossed text of MT. I incline to the latter position.

80. The plural reading וימרו at viii.7 for MT 2:6 ויאמר is consistent with the preceding ישאו. In its plene script, the quiescent א is omitted. G and S have the plural, whereas V (et dicetur) implies the imperfect Niphʿal in the singular, confirming the consonants of MT, but not its pointing. According

to Segert (No. 264), T gives both variants one after the other: ''מרון ליה וי''מר. The former, as he notes, provides the preceding object with a verb; and the latter serves to introduce the following "Woe." However, the first verb may readily be interpreted as a Targumic gloss, intended to provide the clause where it stands with a verb, and a neutral word like אמר would most readily be supplied. Wellhausen, followed by Marti, had already conjectured ו'אמרו; and Horst deleted the conjunction in order to obtain 'אמרו. For this deletion there is no support, unless ''מרון of T be interpreted as preserving such a variant. The combined witness of G, S, and DSH is a strong one on behalf of the plural verb with the preceding conjunction. As Segert himself recognizes, the reading is superior to MT without any deletion of the conjunctive ו. It is unnecessary to improve upon this text by emendation, as he is inclined to do.

81. The reading ולוא at viii.7 for MT 2:6 לא involves both plene spelling of the negative particle and the prefixing of the conjunction ו. The defective script ולא is found in Kenn. 224. The entire clause לוא לו (ו) is to be interpreted in any case as the object of the verb המרבה. The fact that the versions so translate indicates nothing; but the fact that none of them gives any recognizable evidence for the ו would tend to favor the MT. So Segert (No. 227).

82. The reading of עד מתי יכביד (loc. cit.) is certainly smoother than MT ומכביד עד-מתי; but it is not thereby to be

preferred. Metrical regularity is disturbed by the words עֵד מְאֹד, and they were therefore rejected by Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti, Horst etc. as a gloss. Moreover the participial reading of MT yields better parallelism and is supported by the versions, including V (despite the finite verb)--as shown by the parallelism qui multiplicat ..... et aggravat. So Segert (No. 265). One must agree with Molin and Elliger, therefore, that MT is superior. The reading in DSH probably arose simply as an easier construction, but it is possible as Segert observes that ם before the similarly appearing ם and ם may have been accidentally omitted, occasioning our reading of the first letter of DSH's variant as a ד rather than a ר.

83. עלר at viii.7 for MT 2:6 עֻלִּיר is purely orthographic as the passage is interpreted in DSH. Del Medico follows G's rendering τὸν κλοιὸν αὐτοῦ, i.e., "his yoke." In the script of DSH, however, as Segert (No. 266) maintains, this should be written plene עולר as in all other similar cases with this vowel. Cp. his Nos. 29-34.

84. עבמם appears defective at viii.8 for MT 2:6 עִבְּמִים. The word is a hapax legomenon which was read as עַב מִים by S and V, a reading found in some MSS of MT also: Kenn. 1, 30, 128, 158, 159, 180, 225, 226, 228, 245; Gins. 10, 11, 13, 21, 26, 27, ed. 17. It is possible that the word was so interpreted in DSH. See exposition of 9 25. The text is so ambiguously written in DSH that one is uncertain whether it is intended as one or two

words; but the defective script favors the reading as one word, especially if (as Segert, no. 267, considers possible) DSH understood another nominal type than the MT attested qatlil. (Cp. qatlal, qatlil, qatlul, qitlal, and qutlal types listed by Ges.-Kautsch-Cowley, 84 k, l, m).

84a. הלוא (plene) viii.13 = MT 2:7, where however some MSS read defectively הלא: Kenn. 1, 2, 4, 17, 29, 30, 72, 89, 93, 94, 96, 102, 112, 113, 116, 141, 150, 154, 158, 168, 172, 176, 178, 182, 224, 243, 245, 250, 252, 253, 258; Gins. 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 15, 21, 24, 26, 27, 34, 37, 50, 68, 69, ed. 4.

85. At viii.13 one is probably to restore פת[ע]אום for MT 2:7 פתע. This was first suggested by the present writer's SBLE paper, December, 1948, and has been proposed also by Dupont-Sommer (op. cit., p. 144), Bo Reicke (op. cit., p. 36), Elliger (op. cit., p. 53), Segert (No. 228), etc. As all have seen, the form in DSH is a contamination of the form פתע with the common form פתאם, the former occurring seven times in OT, the latter twenty-five times. The less frequent form of MT should be given the preference.

86. ו׳קומר appears at viii.13 for MT 2:7 ׳קומר, differing from the MT through the addition of the conjunctive ו, but agreeing with its plene script, though some MSS read defectively ׳קמר, thus: Kenn. 2, 93, 150, 154, 159, 224. The effect of the variant is to emphasize by its conjunction the preceding words

which thereby become a nominal clause, the present word then introducing the verbal clause:

> Shall not it be suddenly
> that thy exactors arise,
> that thy tormentors awaken--
> so that thou become booty for them?

The rhythm would become 2/2/2/3 for MT 3/2/3. In either case the verse is metrically tolerable. It would also be possible to scan MT in the same manner as DSH.[44] There is no external evidence favoring the new reading, so that one may suspect that the combination ....ך'ר was influenced by the following verb ך'קיצ'ר.

87. At viii.14 one is probably to restore ך'[נשכ]ר, but perhaps ך'[נרשכ]ר, in the place of MT 2:7 נשכיך. The conjunction prefixed in DSH was recognized anciently as an error and was marked by a short stroke above and below the letter, as van 't Land, van der Woude, Elliger and Segert (No. 214) suggest. Cp. after Elliger (op. cit., p. 69) the short strokes above the dittographic לע of vii.2, and the dots above and below the first ו of שחוקו of iv.6. If one restores defectively after Molin (ThZ, 1952, p. 354) and Elliger, the ר before נ may be charged to metathesis of the first two letters in a plene Vorlage. With either restoration the spurious ר may well be dittographic

---

44. Segert (No. 283), conversely, scans DSH precisely as the MT.

of the final letter of the preceding word. The plene script is attested by Kenn. 17, 113, 246, 258, 260, 264. Odd readings are נשבי׳ך Kenn. 72 and נשכך Kenn. 91.

88. ר׳ק׳צו at viii.14 for MT 2:7 ר׳קצו is to be derived from the primary stem ק׳ץ rather than from קצ׳ as in MT vocalization. Thus already Molin (loc. cit.), Elliger (op. cit., p. 54) and Segert (No. 151). The latter in plene script becomes ר׳׳קצו in Kenn. 24, 99, 182, 254, 270, 290, 300; Gins. 2, 17, 22, 26, 36, 52, 58, ed. 15. The reading רק׳צו of Kenn. 93 is probably to be explained as an error of metathesis in the transmission of MT, but it may be read as from the same stem as DSH, only ו-consecutive perfect occurs rather than simple ו with the imperfect.

89. In the case of מזע׳ע׳כה at viii.14, the first ׳ is unattested in MT 2:7; and since it is not morphologically to be expected, it will naturally be regarded as an error--as Segert (No. 46) supposes. Scribal errors would seem to account also for מזעזעך Kenn. 3 and primo מזעז׳ך Kenn. 178.

90. ה׳׳ת׳ה at viii.14 for MT 2:7 ה׳׳ת is now defective and now plene in contrast with MT; but precisely this orthography is attested by Kenn. 1, 30! An odd reading is ה׳׳ת׳ attested by Kenn. 154, Gins. 3. Gins. notes that the Q of the latter is in agreement with the K of other MSS.

91. At viii.14 one will certainly restore למש[׳]סרה for MT 2:7 למשסרת, despite the hesitation of Segert (No. 44). The

orthography of DSH is witnessed also by Kenn. 1, 4, 93, 116, 224, 258, 260, 264. Cp. also למש׳סת of Kenn. 17, and contrast the completely defective script למסת of Kenn. 246.

92. שלוהה at viii.15 and ix.3 for MT 2:8 שלוה is the expected plene form of text.

93. ו׳שלוכה at viii.15 and ix.3 for MT 2:8 ׳שלוך gives us a conjunctive ו before the apodosis to the foregoing causal protasis. It makes for livelier movement, as Segert (No. 200) observes, an effect perhaps too subtle to be represented in the versions (Segert No. 230). The presence or absence of the ו before ׳ may be explained as an error through either dittography or haplography, respectively. The twice occurrence of the reading in DSH strengthens its attestation, making it appear probable that this was the reading of the Vorlage of the ancient commentator. Cp. Molin, ThZ, 1952, p. 354. This conclusion is confirmed also by the newly discovered Greek recension (Barthélemy, RB, LX, 1953, p. 29).

94. כול at viii.15 and ix.3 for MT 2:8 כל is an example of plene script, where ו represents qameṣ ḥatuph.

95. [וכ]ול is to be restored at ix.8 for MT 2:8 וכל. Odd readings are the omission of the word in Kenn. 126, and omission of the conjunction in Kenn. 93. There is no attestation of the scriptio plena of DSH.

96. ושבו was first omitted, but later inserted above the line at ix.8 where MT 2:8 reads defectively שבו ; but the full spelling of DSH is found in Kenn. 17, 96, 112, 139, 161, 178, 182, 254. According to Segert (No. 216) the word above the line has a somewhat different ductus, was written with a different pen perhaps, but apparently by the same hand. However, ו and ' are clearly distinguished in the first two letters of the verb in a manner not characteristic of the scribe of DSH. It appears probable therefore that the interpolation was made by another scribe. Whether or not the omission in DSH was due to error on the part of the commentator or the scribe of the present document, the reading is intelligible and is to be recorded as a true variant.

97. DSH reads הבוצץ at ix.12 (the unintelligible השצץ of the first printing of the editio princeps of DSS I is a typographical error). The reading of DSH contrasts with the defective and anarthrous בצץ of MT 2:9. The plene reading בוצץ is attested by Kenn. 4, 94, 112, 178, 225, 269.

98. The reading לנצל at ix.13 for MT 2:9 להנצל is only an orthographic variant, the ה having been assimilated in the Niph'al infinitive.[45] The contracted form in DSH is late, and is therefore inferior to the archaic form of MT.

---

45. So Rost, ThLZ, 1950, col. 479; Lehmann, PEQ, Jan., 1951, p. 51; Habermann, ad loc.; Molin, ThZ, 1952, p. 354; Elliger, op. cit., p. 55; van 't Land, and van der Woude, ad loc; Segert (No. 65).

99. עצתה' plene, occurs at ix.13 for MT 2:10 עצת'.

99a. בשת at ix.13 appears in scriptio defectiva as in MT 2:10, against בושת of Kenn. 150.

100. לב'תכה appears at ix.14 for MT 2:10 לב'תך. The final ה characteristically, is added for qameṣ. There is no ' to indicate the segholate of the pausal form as in לב'ת'ך of Kenn. 89, 96, 154, 250.

101. קצורת at ix.11 is no purely orthographic variant for MT 2:10. It is a case of a noun replacing the infinitive. It is the plural of קצת or קצוה--the former theoretical root being given by most lexicographers, but the latter by A. Harkavy.[46] The word is found in the absolute form qᵉṣāwôth in Ex. 38:5 and Ps. 65:9. Harkavy would vocalize the suffixed form of the Kᵉthibh at Ex. 37:8 and 39:4 as qaṣwôthāw. Habermann vocalizes the Hab. text as qaṣwôth both here and at x.2 where the word occurs defectively spelled with one ו; and surely thus can the variant spellings of the scroll with one or two ו's be explained, as Segert (no. 42) observes, only he suggests as an alternative vocalization qiṣwôth. Is. 41:5 in DSIᵃ employs קצאורת (for MT קצות) in the plural construct, its א for qameṣ implying the uncontracted form qᵉṣāwôth even in the construct relationship. The consonantal texts can be read in precise

---

46. Student's Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary to the Old Testament, 1914.

agreement if one regards the script of MT as defective. For all three occurrences of קצות in MT IS., DSI^{a} reads קצורות (or קצאורת). See at Is. 40:38; 41:5, 9. The defective orthography קצות would certainly be original in both Hab. and Isa., with ambiguity as to derivation. In the case of Hab. both the infinitive and pl. noun readings are perhaps wrong; for the critical view that one should read the finite verb is attractive--a reading which finds no support in DSH where we would expect, as Segert perceives, קצותה . Cp., however, G and S. See further under No. 102.

102. רחוט' ix.14 and x.2; MT 2:10 רחוטא . The word is omitted in Kenn. 99. There are alternative interpretations of the present variant. The first would equate the terms phonetically and treat the readings as merely orthographic variants--' standing for *ṣere* and replacing quiescent א . This sort of omission has many illustrations in the DSS. Yalon (*op. cit.*, p. 174b f.) and Segert (No. 53) compare מרי'=מרה at DSH xii.11. Cp. No. 129 below. Yalon would refer us to numerous examples of this in Aramaic, in the tongue of the *ḥ^{a}khāmîm*, and in the ancient poems of Palestine. The following are given as a few of the many examples in the Samaritan Pentateuch: על' ז'ה (Gen. 8:11), קנ' שמ'ם וארץ (Gen. 14:19), and with slightly variant text אל עמם השר' (Gen. 14:17). He refers us also to the unapocopated imperative צר' of Is. 38:1 DSI^{a}. In all of these ' represents *ṣere* and replaces ה . Segert's suggestion that

חוטי might also be read as a plural, with א elided at the beginning of a syllable is less likely. Cf. מרא' in Sukenik, Meg. Gen. I, p. 23, third line from bottom. If thus DSH and MT be equated, one may note their agreement in the matter of plene orthography, as against רחמא in Kenn. 23, 30, 89, 91, 96, 113, 161, 172, 243, 246, 252, 253, 258, 260, 264, 270; Gins. 11, 24, 34, 37, 47, 55, edd. 1, 3, 10, 15. The asyndeton חומא is attested by Kenn. 99.

The second alternative interprets חוטי as the pl. of חוט (thread), or as the singular of the same noun with Yodh compaginis. Elliger (op. cit., p. 53), who deletes (after many critics) עמ'ם רב'ם, suggests reading qaṣṣôthā hûṭi naphšekhā, "Du hast den Faden deines Lebens abgeschnitten." Lehmann[47] argues that the parallelism with קצורת indicates that חוטי is nominal. For the apocalyptic sense given the word, cf. the exposition under 7:28. Our view is that the first alternative explains the origin of the reading; but that the exposition is based upon the second alternative. Both parallelism and meter are badly disrupted in either text, so that emendation is probably necessary. G. R. Driver's emendation,[48] וקצרת חמא נפשך "and thou hast fulfilled the sin of thy soul," is attractive and may claim the support of G συνεπέρανας for a Heb. verb קצה=Arab. $\sqrt{\text{قضى}}$ I, "fulfilled (a duty), satisfied (a want)."

---

47. PEQ, Jan.-Apr., 1951, pp. 37 f.

48. JTS, 39, 1938, p. 395.

103. נפשכה, plene, ix.14 and x.2; MT 2:10 נפשך.

104. כי׳א ix.14; MT 2:11 כי׳.

105. בונה (scr. pl.) x.6; MT 2:12 בנה. The scr. pl. is found also in: Kenn. 2, 3, 17, 29, 89, 96, 112, 113, 126, 128, 139, 150, 154, 168, 224, 246, 249, 252, 258, 269, 270; primo 82; Gins. 3, 10, 15, 21, 24, 26, 37, 49, 58, 65, 69, edd. 1, 12, 13, 15. Cp. בונ׳ Kenn. 253.

106. ו׳כונן x.6; MT 2:12 וכונן. It is a question of tense and usage. According to Stonehouse (op. cit., p. 206) one finds in the MT the "Perf. with ו-consecutive continuing the ptcp. and expressing habit or custom: 'and habitually establishes a city, et.'"* Segert, however, interprets otherwise, finding no precise analogy to the coordinate consecutive perf. after the ptcp. in Hab. 2:12 MT. Perhaps the variant is a consecutive imperfect. Note the usage recognized by Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley (§ 111, u): "In dependence on participles, which represent what at present continues or is being repeated." Apart from orthographic tendencies of the DSS, the reading of DSH could thus be regarded as at least equally excellent as the MT. Segert, however, cites examples of the tendency in DSI[a] to avoid the ו-consecutive construction, and he would therefore interpret DSH as a ו-conjunctive. There is no strong tendency to avoid this construction in the Hab. text of DSH, however, this being the only possible example of it. ו-consecutive sometimes occurs

---

*Perhaps, however, examples of this should be revocalized as inf. abs. Cp. J. Huesman, "Finite Uses of the Infinitive Absolute," Biblica, xxxvii (1956), pp. 271-295.

even in the commentary. It is noteworthy, perhaps, that in the four examples of prefixing to the imperfect tense of the verb (Nos. 34, 39, 86, 93), the future or continuing reference in the simple imperfect of the MT is preserved by the purely conjunctive construction of DSH. This would tend to favor MT over DSH. The fact that the versions translate both verbs in this verse as ptcps. (thus G, T, S) is of doubtful textual value, since they may well have favored consistent construction in translation. It would be unsafe to infer from this that they read כוננ as a Qal participle of √כנן which if found in the O.T. has another sense than √כון of the Polel stem. This possibility entertained with hesitation by Segert appears very doubtful. Elliger (op. cit., p. 56) reads ו-conjunctive and regards it as probably better than the MT, since imperfects are found in the next verse; but this reasoning is of doubtful validity, for v. 13 starts afresh, being in no way dependent upon the construction of v. 12.

106a. Hab. 2:12, as cited at x.6, reads קרית in agreement with MT, against scr. pl. קיריות of Kenn. 96.

106b. הלוא (scr. pl.) x.6 agrees with MT 2:13; note scr. def. הלא: Kenn. 1, 2, 4, 17, 29, 30, 72, 89, 93, 96, 112, 113, 116, 126, 128, 141, 150, 158, 168, 172, 178, 224, 245, 252, 253, 258, 260, 264, 269; Gins. 7, 10, 11, 21, 24, 27, 34, 37, 40, 50, 52, 57, 68, 69, edd. 1, 3, 6, 10, 12, 13.

106c. הנה x,7 retained in agreement with MT 2:13 against omission in Kenn. 180.

107. כעש x,7; MT 2:13 פאם As to sense, there is no distinction,[49] but since פאם was no longer employed in the Mishnah,[50] one may interpret the variant as an alteration in line with later usage. Thus Segert (No. 184).

108, 110. At x, 7 f. one will compare the verbs of Hab. 2:13 with those of MT and the similar Jer. 51:58b as follows: DSH [ור'יעפו] יעפו'' ..... ונעו'; MT יעפו' ..... ר''ונעו; Jer. ר'יעפו..... ר'ונעו. At first examination the reading of DSH seems nearer that of Jer.; for in the case of the first verb it is one letter nearer the text of Jer., and in the case of the second verb one may read identically, in view of the ambiguity of ו and ' in the scroll. A similar ambiguity doubtless existed in some ancient mss. of Jer.; for as Rudolph (BH$^{3-7}$) observes, G, S, and Theod. translate as though they read יעפו''. It would be a mistake, however, to regard the reading of DSH as necessarily harmonistic, as does Segert (Nos. 270-271); for some mss. of MT Hab. are equally close in agreement with DSH, reading יעפו'' ..... ר'ונעו. Thus: Kenn. 1, 29, 30, 72, 94, 102, 154, 155, 158, 180. 225, 227;

---

49. Elliger, op. cit., p. 56.

50. M. H. Segal, A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew, p. 300.

Gins. 3, 11, 13, 15, 24, 58, 68. Kenn. 141 still reads the first verb thus and the second verb is annotated as primo thus. These mss. present the same inconsistency as DSH with the first verb scr. def. and the second verb scr. pl., if we assume the simple imperfect reading of DSH in each case. The following additional mss. and editions attest the reading וי'גע: Kenn. 2, 4, 17, 82, 93, 116, 150, 161, 172, 178, 249, 252, 269, 300; primo 128, 130; Gins. 7, 21, 40, 50, 57, edd. 6, 12, 13. The following additional mss. attest ויעפ': Kenn. 23, 89, 96, 112, 173, 176, 182, 226, 228, 251; forte 91; Gins. 2, 10, 52. Variations in the use of matres lectionis should not be adduced as evidence of harmonistic approach to Jer. They may be wholly fortuitous. On the other hand וי'עפ of Kenn. 178 is certainly harmonistic. Probably the only real variant is the absence of the ו before יגע' which has against it the weight of both MT Hab. and MT Jer. All the versions except the Syriac attest the conjunction. The omission makes for a smoother text, and it is to be rejected therefore as the easier reading. The most primitive reading would naturally be the reading of both verbs defectively, as they are in the mss. listed as additional attestation for וי'גע. Segert has shown that the trans. ולאות of T in the case of Hab. and of et labores of V in the case of Jer. presuppose a noun in the construct state, either יג'ע' or יג'ע'—the former being from ע'ג', and the latter from יגע which in Job 20:18 means "gain," but which occurs in Genesis Rabba in the sense of

"toil, work." These indirectly attest the def. reading ורִיגְעָ. G renders both verbs as aorists and therefore implies most certainly the defective script יעֲבַ for the second verb. In the case of the first verb, it may have read either ורִיגְעָ or ''געָ, according as it interpreted the ו as conjunctive, or consecutive. It would be possible to interpret both verbs in DSH as perfs. by reading after Jer. ורִיעֲבַ . DSH would not thereby approach G, for the consonants of the Vorlage of the latter were rather in exact (or very nearly exact) agreement with MT. One may not cite the perfs. in the commentary as evidence for the reading of perfects in DSH, since what was future to Habakkuk may well be past for the commentator. One may note, however, that the inconsistency of the orthography in DSH between now def. and now pl orthography may be resolved by reading ורִיעֲבַ ..... יגעָ and taking both as perfects. This would be most reasonable in view of the tendency toward scr. pl. for the imperf. In this case, Segert's interpretation of the text of DSH as harmonistic with Jer. would stand secure. The possibility of an inconsistent orthography, however, prevents certainty.

109. ולאומים x, 8; MT 2:13 ולאמים. The scr. pl. is attested by Kenn. 4, 72, 89, 112.

111. כי'א x, 14; MT 2:14 כי.

111a. As Segert (No. 208) observes, in כבוד of x, 14, the initial כ seems to be written over ב. The scribe had nearly

omitted the כ, but he apprehended and corrected his mistake before resuming. Cp. the similar cases of Nos 119a and 121a.

112. At x, 15 restore [ם]על ה׳ for MT 2:14 עלי׳ם. The article is attested by Kenn. 245. Cp. ם׳# in Kenn. 82, also את ה׳ם in de Rossi 545 primo. Already in December, 1948, I had indicated at the national SBLE meeting that the rendering αὐτούς in G pointed to the reading עלי׳הם which as an error of metathesis supports the reading of the article. Now, also Segert (No. 231) observes the same. Lachmann, as he points out, supposed the same Vorlage for G, only asserting strangely that ם׳הם=ם׳ the ה occurring for qameṣ. This phonetic value is attested, however, only for the final position. Elliger (op. cit., p. 56) points out the preference of DSH for the article, but notes that the article is commended metrically. The elasticity of Heb. rhythm renders this observation inconclusive. One will agree with Elliger and Segert (No. 283) that the verse is to be scanned as poetry, despite certain critics who regard it as prosaic.

113. רע׳הר xi, 2; MT 2:15 רעהר. According to Segert (No. 113), the readings are only orthographically different, the ׳ having arisen by false analogy to forms with the etymological stem consonant, i.e., as if derived from רעה rather than רע. He cites under his No. 122 the variant readings of II Sam. 12:11, רע׳ך and רעך--both pronounced alike; and he would have us compare the K and Q of Prov. 3:28. However, a pl. is also possible.

Cp. Job 42:7; Zech. 3:8. In view of the 3rd pl. pronom. suf. at the end of the verse, it seems probable that the present variant should be read as a pl. in agreement of number. Marti had already proposed this. For such orthographic omissions see the same word in I Sam. 30:36; Job 42:10. If in such cases one may read a collective singular, it is certainly to be preferred as the more difficult, yet satisfactory reading. See also Humbert, op. cit., p. 55.

114. חמתו xi, 3; MT 2:15 חמתך. Segert (Nos. 272-273) has summarized the external evidence as follows: (1) supporting the 2nd per. suf., MT, Aq. Theodotion, Quinta; (2) supporting the 3rd per. suf., DSH, V, Sym.; (3) supporting no suf., G, two other Greek versions cited by Jerome, S, T. In all the other cases where a participial phrase follows a pronouncement of "woe," as Segert observes, the object of the ptcp. takes the 3rd per. suf. Thus in 2:6, 9, 15aα. The third group of witnesses indirectly support the 3rd per. suf. inasmuch as the ו may have been omitted through haplography before the following ראך--a haplography which occurs in reverse in the רעיהו אך of DSH! See No. 115. The strong external testimony combined with the internal has led most modern critics to prefer the 3rd per. suf. Thus Sellin, Wellhausen, Graetz, Nowack, G. A. Smith, A. B. Davidson, Marti, S. R. Driver, Stonehouse, Horst (but altering the word). According to Molin,[51] Elliger (op. cit., p.

---

51. ThZ, 1952, p. 355.

and Delcor the reading of DSH confirms the preference of modern critics. Rost[52] had already concluded similarly, noting that though the 3rd per. suf. is the easier reading it may nevertheless be right.

115. אף xi, 3; MT 2:15 ראף. The only direct support is Kenn. 150. The versions cited above (under No. 114) for חמת ראף in the place of DSH המהר אף might be claimed as indirect support here, an error having occurred through wrong word division; but since MT reads ו after the 2nd per. suf. (חמתו ראף), this seems unlikely. One will rather, with Segert (Nos. 272 f.), explain the absence of the ו as an error of haplography.

116. הבם occurs at xi, 3 for MT 2:15 הבי֫ם. The scr. def. is attested only by Kenn. 128, 173. Noting the same scr. def. at v, 2 (Hab. 1:13; see variant No. 31), Segert (Nos. 159-160) would consider a vocalization differing from MT. One may observe also that in the citation of Hab. 2:15 in DST (Sukenik, Meg. Gen. II, Pl. ix, li.7)[53] the י is omitted.

117. אל xi,3; MT 2:15 עֲל. The reading of DSH is found also in Kenn. 2, 23, 139, 144, 150, 154, 173, 180, 224, 225, 226, 252, 258, 651; primo 172. Humbert[54] noting that the Hi. of

---

52. ThLZ, 75, 1950, col. 480.

53. Now equivalent to IQH iv,11 of Ogar Ham-megilloth, Pl. 38.

54. Problèmes du Livre d'Habacuc, p. 185.

נבט is often construed with אל, but only here with על proposed correcting the text of Hab. accordingly. Segert (No. 186) suggests that the unusual prep. in MT might have been occasioned by the unusual object. In any case the substitution of אל for על or vice versa, is a common error. For the view of Dupont-Sommer that the word is to be interpreted as "God" both here and in its citation in DST, cp. the exposition of 1Q31.

118. מרעדיהם xi, 3; MT 2:15 מערריהם. The variant involves a confusion of ד for ר and a different location of the mater lectionis. The different placement of ו points to an originally def. text, and tends to confirm Wellhausen's reading מערדיהם from ערה after Nah. 3:5. The scr. def., but doubtless with MT pointing, is attested by Kenn. 93, 245, 249, 477. Stonehouse, however, argues that the derivation from עור is also possible, and refers us to עירם and Ar. عُرْيٌ, The pointing with shureq attested by Gins. 7, 24, 26 emphasizes this derivation. There is thus good reason to posit two equivalent nouns מער and מערר from related roots. The originally def. script could be read either way. G's reading σπήλαια αυτῶν appears to be a mistranslation through confusion with מערה cave, though the latest edition of Liddell and Scott suggests the interpretation "privy parts" as a special meaning for this passage alone.

The most important feature is the substitution of ד for ר. This yields either the noun "festivals" or the Qal

participle "stumblers" (from √מעד). For the latter cp. Job 12:5. The commentary probably interprets both ways. Cp. exposition of פש31. Only the meaning, "their stumblers" yields a tolerable sense here; but even this is without any ancient attestation. As to whether the reading is sectarian in origin, see below.

119. שבעהה xi, 8; MT 2:16 שבעת. Segert (No. 123) observes that G translates שבעת קלון as πλησμονὴν ἀτιμίας, implying the interpretation of the first word as a noun in the construct. Cp. Ezek. 16:49. This reading was only possible in a text lacking the final ה.

119a. At xi, 9, the scribe wrote originally כבוד for MT 2:16 מכבוד, but noting the omission of the מ he hastily assumed that he had miswritten כ for מ, so he therefore retraced the letter converting it into a מ without noticing that this left out the כ. Hence we seem to have מבוד; but at the top of the letter one detects the overlapping marks of both מ and כ. On the other hand, in writing כבוד at x, 14 (Hab. 2:14), it is the כ which the scribe first miswrote as a ב ; but he corrected this before resuming. Again in writing the archaic Tetragrammaton at xi, 10, he started to write the ו immediately after the י but he traced over it the ה and concluded the word without any omission. See Segert No. 216.

120. והרעל xi, 9; MT 2:16 והערל. The variant is supported by G's double translation καὶ διασαλεύθητι καὶ σείσθητι, by

Aquila's rendering καὶ χαρώθητι, by V's et consopire, and by S's ואתטרף. All these suggest the reeling, stupefaction, or swooning of a drunkard rather than the idea of disclosing one's uncircumcision. Only T goes with MT, rendering ואיתערטל, "expose yourself." On the basis of the versions and contextual considerations, Wellhausen emended to read והרעל; and most critics have followed him (including Ehrlich, König, Marti, Horst, Duhm, Nowack, Procksch [BH$^{3-7}$], George Adam Smith, S. R. Driver, Stonehouse). One notes the reference to the "cup of the Lord's right hand" in the following clause and the natural association of the verb "reel," and compares the phrase כוס ההרעלה in Is. 51:17, 22. On the other hand מערי׳הם of the preceding clause (2:15c) may be claimed as contextual support for MT. In BASOR, No. 112, p. 18, n. 76, it was pointed out that the commentary with its reference to the uncircumcised heart (xi, 13) was based upon the reading of MT. Van der Ploeg (op. cit., p. 3b) suggests therefore that the variant may be a scribal error, but he remains in doubt as to this by reason of the attestation of the ancient versions. Other scholars, however, accept the variant as correct and suppose that the interpretation attests merely the commentator's acquaintance with another reading. In view of the strong influence of the Targum upon the interpretations of the scroll, it may even be that this interpretation of הרעל as ערלה לבו stems from that source; or, as H. L. Ginsberg has suggested, from simple

verbal play.[55] The fact that the variant stands opposed to the interpretation is strong evidence that it stood in the Vorlage of the commentator, there being no ground for textual alteration. Thus Yalon. Molin prefers the MT as the more difficult reading, suggesting that the text was altered because of the offensive character of הערל. Van 't Land and van der Woude think it remarkable that in both occurrences of the pudenda (our variants No. 118 and the present No. 120) DSH substitutes a different word. However in the latter case the offensive word was not avoided in the commentary. It seems to the present writer that the error is on the side of MT, that its reading arose as an inadvertent metathesis, occasioned by the reference to the מערריהם in 2:15c. Elliger (op. cit., p. 56) and Segert (No. 276) prefer the reading of DSH, as also Horst who had previously emended thus according to G.

120a. הסרב xi, 10; in agreement with MT 2:16 in contrast with the completely defective spelling חסכ attested by: Kenn. 1, 29, 93, 126, 139, 150, 154, 158, 172, 182, 224, 243; Gins. 3, 7, 10, 11, 26, 27, 40, 50, 57, 58, and in contrast with the fuller spelling חיסרב attested by Kenn. 258, 260, 264.

121. עלימה occurs at xi, 10 for MT 2:16 עלין, ה as customarily being employed for final gameṣ.

---

55. In his oral response at the textual criticism seminar of the SBLE, New York, December, 1948.

121a. As Segert (No. 210) observes, beneath the archaic ה of the Tetragrammaton of Hab 2:16 (at xi, 10) lies the trace of the beginning of an archaic ו. Thus it appears that the scribe nearly omitted the ה by proceeding too quickly to the ו, but he apprehended his mistake and corrected it before the completion of the letter. Cp. above Nos. 111a and 119a.

122. כבודכה at xi, 11; MT 2:16 כבודך.

123. והתה' xii, 1; MT 2:17 ח'תן'. This is a crux interpretum. It was read initially by me as והתה' and derived from √חתה in the sense of "seize."[56] This reading and meaning was followed by Bo Reicke[57] and G. Molin,[58] only the latter in a note propose the emendation והתכה'. The meaning "seize" seems to be supported by Ps. 52:7. Elsewhere it is used of the removal of a glowing coal from the fire; and from this usage Dupont-Sommer[59] drew the meaning attisera (le feu). In this he was followed by M. Delcor (op. cit., p. 27) and G. Lambert (op. cit., p. 296); but Bo Reicke (loc. cit.) regards this sense as difficult and uncertain.

It was next suggested[60] that one read ורחתה, and the word be construed as the conjunction ו plus the noun hittah (terror)

---

56. BASOR, 112, p. 15.
57. Handskrifterna, p. 39.
58. ZKT, 1952, p. 61.
59. RHR, 1950, p. 139.
60. BASOR, 114, p. 9.

from √חתת. The noun occurs only in the construct state, at Gen. 35:5. S. Talmon regarded the reading of the first letter as ו to be correct, but would interpret the word as wᵉḥattî, 2nd perf. Waw consec. of חתת: "And you will be afraid because of the blood of men (which you have spilt)." Van 't Land and van der Woude follow him. G. Molin prefers some form of חתה, also.

Finally it was suggested that one read the word as an error for התכה' the כ having accidentally been omitted; for this would yield a text agreeable with G, T, and S.[61] The ה in DSH, of course, is a characteristic addition for final qameṣ. This view of the text had already been proposed by Yalon (op. cit., p. 175b), Molin,[62] and Elliger (op. cit., p. 220), apparently all independently. It has been followed also by Habermann, Vermès, and Segert (No. 277).

As for the intended reading, the commentary will be decisive. The fact that the final clause begins with מדמ' when quoted separately indicates a syntactical break compelling us to link the variant with what precedes and to read the first letter as '. The fact that the commentary in seemingly direct interpretation of the word consigns the Wicked Priest "to destruction" (xii, 5) indicates the derivation from √חתת, interpreted after T-- תתבר'נך ("will smash you"). One will

---

61. The Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan, p. 7, n. 18. Cp. now The Journal of Jewish Studies, Vol. VII, Nos. 3-4, 1956, p. 175, n. 24.
62. ZKT, 1952, p. 61.

consequently read ה[כ]תת', with its form paralleling the immediately preceding [כסכה']. The prototype from which both the MT and DSH are derived is חתך'. The error in MT arose through confusion of the final ן with final ך. Though DSH lends support to the reading of most expositors, the more usual interpretation of the verb as "terrify" (following G and S) should be given equally serious attention.

124. וכול xii, 1; MT 2:17 וכל.

125. ורזבי' xii, 1; MT 2:17 ובי'. Scr. pl. attested by Kenn. 96, 101, 112, 144, 178.

126. כי' xii, 10; MT 2:18 כי.

127. כסל יצרו xii, 10; MT 2:18 פסלו יצרו. There are at least ten possible constructions of the variant text:

1. פָּסַל יְצָרוֹ (its fashioner has carved)
2. פָּסַל יְצָרוֹ (he has carved his image)
3. פֹּסֵל יְצָרוֹ (a carver has fashioned it)
4. פֹּסֵל יְצָרוֹ (a carver will fashion it)
5. פֹּסֵל יְצָרוֹ (a carver is its fashioner)
6. פְּסָל יָצְרוּ (they fashioned a carved image)
7. פְּסָל יָצְרוּ (they will fashion a carved image)
8. פֶּסֶל יְצָרוֹ (a carved image is his idol)
9. פֶּסֶל יְצָרוֹ (a carved image has he fashioned it)
10. פֶּסֶל יְצָרוֹ (a carved image he will fashion it)

The first alternative (nearest the MT) is that followed in the

first and most subsequent translations. The fourth is that of Bo Reicke: "What profits a stone image, inasmuch as a stone mason will fashion it?" The sixth is that of Segert (No. 278). Van der Ploeg and del Medico paraphrase, thus avoiding alignment with any of these constructions.

The Biblical context eliminates a few of the alternatives. No. 8 would afford no antecedent for the pronominal suffix (his idol). Nos. 9-10 would be tautological. The perfect הועיל would favor the reading of a verb in perfect tense, and would therefore eliminate Nos. 4 and 7. Thus we are left with five alternatives, Nos. 1-3, 5 and 6.

The versions are a second criterion. All of them interpret פסלו as a verb, either as pās^{e}lû (thus G), or as p^{e}sālô (thus V, T, S, the G minuscule codex 410 and Theophilus of Antioch). The fact that they all attest a verb is not necessarily a disadvantage for Segert's reading pesel (No. 6), inasmuch as the reading is unique and may possibly transform the text.[63] As for the second word, it appears to have been read yōṣ^{e}rô as in MT by T, S, V, and Theodotion. G's rendering ἔπλασαν αὐτὸ, however, is based upon the finite verb yāṣ^{e}rû, in line with Segert's interpretation of DSH. This might tend to favor Segert, but the construction is different, it being a matter of two parallel verbs in G, but of only one in DSH which receives pesel as its object. Similarly it is no real support for

---

63. Cp. del Medico, op. cit., p. 117.

y^{e}sārô, No. 3, that some important witnesses of G read ἔπλασεν αὐτό. Thus Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, cod. 613, 410. The versions can provide no sure guide, since they translate a different text.

The orthographic practices of DSH may be appealed to. Though there is a strong tendency toward scr. pl., Holem is not always represented by ו ,so that this is no sure guide. Yet it tends to favor Nos. 2 and 6.

Possibly צרום' of the commentary,at li, 13, reflects the reading of a pl. perf. (No. 6); but this is uncertain, since the number may have been occasioned by hag-gō'îm. Still the use of the verb does weigh against the nominal reading of No. 2. Thus the choice is narrowed to Nos. 1, 3, 5, and 6. The strength of No. 1 is its proximity to MT and its versional supporters. The strength of No. 6 is its full accord with orthographic practices of DSH. The choice should doubtless be between these two; yet Nos. 3 and 5 are very interesting possibilities which would yield a text akin to Wisd. of Sol. 15:16: "for a man made them, and one whose spirit is borrowed formed them" (Wisd.). Cp. here del Medico (op. cit., p. 129).

127a. צרו' xii, 10 in agreement with MT 2:18. The word is probably the ptcp.,[64] in scr. def. as in MT, but in contrast with וצרו' attested by Kenn. 23, 24, 82, 91, 96, 100, 102, 112, 150, 154, 224, 252, 290; Gins. 3, 7, 11, 13, 17, 22, 26, 40, 50, 52, 58, 65, 68, edd., 12, 13.

---

64. Cp. זבחי'ם at vi, 4. See also No. 19a.

128. מסי׳כה xii, 11; MT 2:18 מסכה. The ' (or ו) is clearly visible in its entirety, but a scribe may have attempted erasure. Dupont-Sommer (op. cit., p. 151) regards the scr. pl. surprising and therefore reads מסוכה (thorn bush) after Micah 7:4. Cp. also m^{e}sukhātekhā, "thy covering," of Ez. 28:13. These suggestions, however, are unconvincing. The unusualness of ' for ṣere within a word would account for the attempt at erasure.

129. ומר' xii, 11; MT 2:18 ומורה. If these are to be regarded as equivalent readings, it seems probable that ' in DSH stands for ṣere of construct state (sing. or pl.), rather than seghol, of the absolute form as in MT. The examples of ' in final position given by Yalon (see No. 102 above) occur for ṣere rather than seghol. The interpretation of ' as a final seghol is very precarious. It becomes even more precarious when one suggests, as Segert (Nos. 26, 52, 72, 279) and Rabin (op. cit.,pp. 153 f.), that מר' =מראה --with Aleph omitted at the beginning of a syllable! But cp. G φαντασίαν ψευδῆ and V imaginem falsam. Equating DSH and MT would mean the scr. def. for the former; but ומרה is read in Kenn. 23, 96, 139, 252. Kenn. 150 reads מורה.

With the ' of DSH one may compare מור' of the Micah Midrash;[65] but with as many as two orthographical differences from the MT, one of them being a different consonant, one will

---

65. See J. T. Milik, "Fragments d'un Midrash de Michée dans les Manuscrits de Qumran," RB, LIX, 1952, 414 f.

prefer a dostinctive reading. The initial reading was m^{e}rî,[66] "bitterness" (cp. Job 23:2), or better, "rebelliousness." Thus "Widerspenstigkeit," as Molin, ThZ. For this a contemptuous surrogate for "idol," cp. דחלה שקר (false object of fear) of T, whose Vorlage of the first word would presumably be רמורא. Habermann reads marê ("bitter things of," pl. of adj. מר); and Dupont-Sommer seems to have read m^{e}rîyê ("bitternesses of," pl. of noun m^{e}rî, in defective script), "et des amertumes de tromperie." He suggests also "myrrhes de tromperie," from mōr, myrrh. This would introduce a cultic term in relation to idols.

That DSH does not read "teacher of lies" may be reinforced from the commentary where only idols are mentioned. Elliger (op. cit., p. 57) and Segert (No. 279) think the reading would have risked application by the enemies of the sect to the "Teacher of Righteousness," and that therefore the word "teacher" was avoided here. This involves the doubtful assumption that DSH was written for the enemies of the sect, rather than to bolster the faith of its own adherents. With better reason, Rabin (op. cit., p. 153) writes: "Had the interpreter of DSH known the reading mōreh, he would hardly have missed the opportunity of pointing out to his readers the wickedness of the 'Preacher of Lies.'" The reading in DSH stands alone and is probably in error.

---

66. BASOR, 112, p. 15.

129a צר' xii, 11 as MT 2:18, but against ורצר' of Kenn. 4, 17, 89, 93, 112, 126, 150, 178, 245; forte 113; Gins. 7, 10, 24, 27, 40, 50, 58. The defective script, however, makes possible the reading yēṣer, "inclination, mind"--in accord with T and S which render לבא "the heart." Thus, van der Ploeg (op. cit., p. 4); and this is considered a possibility by Segert (No. 280), who suggests also the meaning Erzeugnis, i.e., a product of shaping, an idol, as in the following word. But one of these words must probably be read as a defectively spelled participle. See No. 130, also the note to No. 127a.

130. וצר'ו xii, 11; MT 2:18 וצרו'. This may be interpreted in line with MT, as yᵉṣārāw, "his images," as in the first and in most subsequent translations. If, however, one is to read the previous word as yēṣer, in sense of "mind," he will read here a ptcp. in line with T and S--"the mind of its fashioners." Segert suggests taking yēṣer in both cases in the sense of something made, in line with V: speravit in figmento fictor ejus; but Segert who must rneder עלי (in contrast with V), would translate: "denn das Erzeugnis seiner Erzeugnise (sc. 'der Götzen') hat sich auf ihn (sc. מרי משקר 'Lehrer' oder 'Erscheinung der Lüge') verlassen." This seems too far-fetched to be likely, and Segert has been brought to this through holding too rigidly to the principle that the ptcp. demands scr. pl. There are two plausible translations: "that the fashioner of his image(s) should trust in it," or "that the mind of its fashioners should trust in it." The former reads

nearly with MT and G, but involves an inconsistency of number between "in it" and "his images." In the latter this inconsistency is eliminated, so that it may be preferable. This in effect would lift No. 129a into the category of a variant, though it is orthographically identical with MT. The proximity of this reading to T and S speaks in its favor. Yet, the inconsistency of number involved in the former alternative may be explained as an example of pluralis excellentiae, since צר'ו equals "his god." Striking examples of this usage are found in DSI[a]. Thus in Is. 45:9 God is spoken of as יוצרי (his fashioner) and חורשי האדמה (the former of the earth). In the latter case, MT reads harŝê ᵃdāmâh ("potsherds of earth") which contextually makes no sense. Cp. also עושי הר Is. 17:7, also בוראכה and יוצרכה of 43:1--the י in each of the last two cases being added superlinearly. This preference for pluralis excellentiae for deity favors the reading yōṣēr yᵉṣārāw, which should be translated exactly as MT, "the fashioner of his image."

131. על'הו xii, 11; MT 2:18 על'ו.

132. It is uncertain what one should read at xii, 15 for MT 2:19 אמר. Rost restores [אמר]ה. Elliger restores [ארמר]ה. Habermann supposed a dittograph here, and restored [ו' האומר]ה. Elliger's restoration is orthographically better than Rost's and fills the space a bit better. Habermann's reading which does even better in filling the space had been entertained by the present writer previously. If one counts the spaces

according to the line above, he finds room for six letters and a space before לעץ (the next word). Elliger's restoration would be two spaces short. Habermann's restoration would be one letter too many, but not impossible, as one may see by calculating according to the second line above, where one more letter appears within the same space. One may also measure הר' at the end of xii, 14, and then allow מורה of xi, 5 (with mostly the same letters) together with the preceding and following spaces to indicate the room required for אומר to see that this is sufficient for Habermann's restoration. One could also restore [הא]מרים. Cp. אמרים of Kenn. 650 B.

132a. The DSH xii, 15 counterpart for MT 2:19 דומם has appeared uncertain in view of the slight flaking off of ink which the first and last letters have suffered, as well as the probable loss of the bottom of the last letter. The first impression was that the reading should be דומה taken as the noun rômâh which is used adverbially in Mic. 2:3, but which would appear here in the genitive relationship. Thus it was rendered "lofty stone,"[67] or more literally "stone of pride."[68] Van der Ploeg's translation élève-toi construes it as the imper. rumah attested in Ps. 21:14. With proper regard for gender, Elliger (op. cit., p. 225) asks: "wäre dann aber nicht דומי zu

---

67. BASOR, 112, p. 16.

68. BASOR, 114, p. 10.

erwarten?" Yet, one might regard this as the vorlage of G. So Barthélemy (op. cit., p. 29) and C. Rabin (op. cit., pp. 154 f.). S is conflate here.

When the editio princeps appeared, the reading was corrected to דומם, in agreement with MT, by reason of a first hand examination of the ms. Thus BASOR,118, p. 9. Dupont-Sommer (op. cit., p. 151) and Delcor (op. cit., p. 28) read likewise. Molin (ThZ, 1952, p. 356) has gone so far as to assert that the reason it was transcribed as in the editio princeps is undiscoverable, the ם being clearly recognizable. This, it would seem, should have removed the uncertainty as to the reading of the first letter, where he recognizes some obscurity. To the contrary, Talmon (VT, I, 1, 1951, p. 37), Habermann, Elliger, van 't Land and van der Woude, and Segert all read מדום. The last mentioned suggests that a ד was corrected out of a ר (No. 209), the Vorlage of G being that of our initial reading (No. 232). Talmon, taking issue with MT vocalization, supposes it to be either an adv. where one would expect an adj., or a wrongly pointed adj. (dûmām instead of dômēm). But the adj. should be fem., dōm^{e}mâh; and this, he avers, has been contracted to dômâh in DSH. To this position van 't Land and van der Woude give their questioning assent. The others, however, read a noun. Elliger (op. cit., p. 60, n. 2 p. 225) despite dûmâh attested in Ps. 94:17; 115:17, would vocalize dummâh. Segert (No. 232) observes that T, S, and V, though rendering the word with an adj., may well have been expressing thereby the genitive relationship of the noun form.

It is wholly a matter of palaeography and the condition of the Ms. As for the first letter, it is mere chipping of the ink which gives the irregular appearance, suggesting to Segert that a ר has been corrected to ד. The point of juncture between the horizontal stroke and the upright stroke proved low enough on the upright stroke (upon first hand examination) as to verify an original ד. The final letter in its present form resembles a ה rather than a ם, but the bottom of the letter is missing. The minute clear space below each upright stroke in the photograph is deceptive, the surface of the leather having peeled off for a slight distance above the edge of the tear. Note the same phenomenon in the left stroke of the ה on the same line. The bottoms of the upright strokes bend slightly to the left. With this cp. the ם of "Jerusalem" (li, 7) where the same angles occur. Unfortunately a flake of ink has disappeared from the right side of the top horizontal stroke, but this stroke appears to have followed the same angle as the top of the final ם (though in medial position) of להמה (li, 14); but it might seem to project slightly too far to the right like both occurrences of ה in the last cited word; but in this respect it resembles the final ם of הגוים (xiii, 1). Though it is understandable why some may prefer to read דומה, the reading דומם in exact agreement with MT seems assured.

133. מלפנ׳ו occurs at xiii, 1 for MT 2:20 מפנ׳ו. Rost[69]

---

69. ThLZ, 1950, col. 480.

notes a shade of difference in meaning: "so that in the place of silence by reason of the terrifying face of God appears silence in the presence of the kingly God." This subtlety seems doubtful; for the former meaning fits better the application of the passage to the "Day of Judgment" and the resultant destruction of the wicked. Possibly the variant reflects late or dialectic usage. Cp. מלפנ' for מפנ' in a pesher citation of Psalm 57:1.[70]

134. כול xiii, 1; MT 2:20 כל. The ו may quite as well express the Qamets Hatuph of MT as the Holem of Habermann's transcription. Contrast חכל of Kenn. 4.

135. הרץ xiii, 1; MT 2:20 הארץ. Rost (op. cit., col. 479) queried whether this might not be a case of assimilation of quiescent א, as in la'donay and le'lohim, but noted that the scribe has often miscopied. Although the word occurs correctly spelled at xiii, 4 and elsewhere in the scroll, the former suggestion is preferable. Thus Segert (No. 70), whose conclusion may be strengthened by observing that הרץ occurs also in IS. 49:6 in DSI^{b}.

135a. The omission of Chap. III from the commentary of DSH is of only doubtful textual significance, though like others I too at first regarded the omission of the chapter from the commentary as important, first of all in an oral presentation at the SBLE meeting held in New York in 1948, and later as set forth in the

---

[70] D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, Oxford, 1955, I, 81.

descriptive leaflets (or programs) which were given those attending the scroll exhibit at Duke University in February, 1950:

> The fact that the scroll does not quote the third and last chapter of the Book supports a view long held by many scholars that this last chapter is not a part of the original prophetic book, but an independent psalm which, having been ascribed to Habakkuk, was later added to his book. The Hebrew Old Testament was put in its final form with all three chapters of Habakkuk at the Council of Jamnia in 90 A.D. It is therefore inconceivable that a commentary upon a two-chapter edition of the book could have been written after that date.

This statement required modification in order to allow for the possibility, even probability, that some copies of the Book of the Twelve Prophets may have already contained Hab. 3. What took place at Jamnia was at most only standardization in this regard. The fact that the Twelve already constituted a separate collection by about 200 B.C., as attested by Sirach 49:10 cannot prove the universal inclusion of Hab. 3 at that time. Neither can its inclusion in the LXX Greek Version be pressed as proving such inclusion in all Hebrew mss.; for in this regard it may well represent a different recension. Still it renders quite doubtful any omission of the passage.

The fact that the chapter is a prayer (or psalm) bearing special musical annotations such as the superscription, subscription, and several occurrences of "Selah" has long served to differentiate it from the rest of the book, and it has given rise to a common critical view that the chapter does not belong to the original prophecy but was inserted later from a book of hymns, one of which bore a superscription ascribing it to Habakkuk. In the LXX, Pss. 138 and 146-148 are attributed to Haggai and Zechariah.

Analogies for such insertions are not lacking, e.g., the Prayer of Jonah (which is unsuited to its context) and the Prayer of Hezekiah (Is. 38:9-20), which is not contained in Kings whence this narrative portion of Isaiah was borrowed by the compilers of the Book of Isaiah.

The critical view regarding Chap. III seems sound, but it neither proves nor disproves the correctness of the ascription of this chapter to Habakkuk. Our interest here is simply whether the prophetic text of Habakkuk ever stood alone without the appended prayer, and whether the omission of the chapter in DSH is important textually.

Segert[71] states alternative explanations for the omission: either the chapter was unsuited to the purpose of the interpreter, or it was not contained in his Book of Habakkuk. The former explanation had been posed by G. Lambert,[72] Leonard Rost,[73] and Ed. Nielsen.[74] The latter explanation (already posed above) had been advanced already by R. de Vaux,[75] J. Roberts,[76] A. Dupont-Sommer,[77] and A. M. Habermann.[78] Both

---

[71] Archiv Orientálni, xxi, 1953, p. 219.

[72] NRTh, 71, No. 3, 1949, p. 294.

[73] ThLZ, 75, 1950, col. 477.

[74] STh, Vol. VI, Fasc. 1, 1953, p. 58.

[75] La Vie Intellectuelle, June 1949, pp. 592 f.

[76] ZAW, lxii (N. F. xxi), 1950, p. 236.

[77] La Nouvelle Clio, i-ii, 1949-1950, p. 331.

[78] Op. cit., p. 39.

sides of the argument press the divergent character of the chapter, the one as an explanation of its unsuitability to an existential application to contemporary history, the other by way of emphasizing the improbability of its belonging to the original book. R. de Vaux (loc. cit.) anticipated the general explanation for the omission, but he regarded it as ingenious and unconvincing:

> On répondra sans doute que le Cantique se prêtait moins aux accommodations historiques qu' affectionne ce commentateur, mais celui-ci était ingénieux et il en aurait pu tirer aussi bon parti que du reste. Permettons aux critiques de triompher....

Delcor, in his study of Hab. 3,[79] holds that the psalm is dependent upon Ps. 77, but concludes that the literary genre of the midrash is sufficient explanation for its omission in DSH. However, in a note (loc. cit., n. 36) he qualifies his remarks by observing that this line of argument would be enfeebled if one could prove the thesis of Isaac Rabinowitz[80] that a midrash of Psalm 107 was among the documents from the Dead Sea. One is no longer dependent solely upon this fragmentary text, however; for it is now clear from the recent publication of D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik[81] that there was certainly a pesher of the Psalms in the Qumran Cave I. In this volume, fragments of

---

[79] Miscellanea Biblica Ubach. B, B., 1954, p. 298.

[80] BA, xiv, 1951, pp. 50-52.

[81] Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, Oxford, 1955, I, 81 f.

Psalms 57 and 68 have been published. Likewise according to them, in the Qumran Cave IV, fragments of a commentary upon Psalms 37 and 57 have been recovered. Already J. M. Allegro ("A Newly Discovered Fragment of a Commentary on Psalm XXXVII from Qumran," PEQ, May-Oct., 1954, pp. 69-75) has published the text of nearly two whole columns of the 4Q pesher to Psalm 37. Thus it is incontestably clear that psalms were found suitable to the purposes of Midrash Pesher. J. Roberts has observed that Hab. 3 and DSH "are equally eschatological, and the Psalm may be a kind of commentary on the prophecy." If so, Hab. 3 would seem especially well suited to the purposes of our sect, and one is attracted to J. Roberts' conclusion: "The omission of ch. 3, undoubtedly supports the Higher Critics." Of more doubtful value is the argument of Georg Molin (ThZ, VIII, 5, 1952, p. 347) that DSH vii, 2 implies ignorance of Chap. III on the part of the midrashic author of our pesher. On this see the exposition of DSH ¶ 20.

Any final evaluation of the textual omission of Hab. 3 must await the determination, if possible from fragmentary remains of other commentaries, whether it was customary for the Qumran Community to treat whole prophetic books within such compositions.

ANALYSIS OF TEXTUAL FINDINGS

1. Orthographic Features

A large per cent of the variants discussed above are purely orthographic in character; but they should not be lightly dismissed, for the following reasons: (1) the text of DSH is characterized and distinguished by them from other Heb. texts of Hab. 1-2, (2) many of its orthographical variants find attestation in the Heb. mss., and (3) they are a feature pointing to the relative antiquity of DSH. The first of these points has hitherto been examined only in the light of a standard MT. The second and third have been neglected altogether. Stanislav Segert in the first installment of his important study devoted over twenty-one pages to the distinctive orthographic, phonetic, and morphological aspects of the Hab. text contained in DSH. Elliger, in the fourth chapter of his magnum opus has devoted nearly as much space to the same type of survey, taking within his purview the materials of the expository sections as well. Our discussion of each variant in turn has made further discussion of most of the textual variants unnecessary. Yet in working one's way through the maze of textual data, one may perhaps grasp only vaguely the over-all picture. In order to give within a moment of time and a minimum of space a "bird's eye view" of the whole, we have prepared a number of charts. The first set is devoted to the frequency of scr. pl. We

compare the orthography with both the MT and the variants of Medieval Heb. Mss. Therefore all listings, both primary and secondary, are brought into play. The charts are largely self-explanatory.

FREQUENCY OF PLENE SCRIPT

GRAM. FORM	VARIANT NO.	WORD PLENE WITH MT	NO. MSS. DEFECTIVE	VARIANT NO.	WORD PLENE AGAINST MT	NO. MSS. PLENE
NOUN	52b	הרכתי	2	26	כרחר	1
				27	לאלוהר	1
	53	הלרחרת (2nd Waw)	16 (12+4)	53	הלרחרת (1st Waw)	14 (10+4)
	91	למש[']סרת (for Waw)	2 (1+1)	91	למש[']סרת (fully)	8
				109	רלארמים	4
				128	מס[']כה	0
				21	לכרל	0
				72 75 94 134	כרל	0
				95 124	רכרל	0
VERB	16a	יברא	42	4	יסרפר	0
	86	(ר)יקרמר (2nd Waw)	6 יקמר	15	יערפר	27-28
	120a	תסרב	22 תסב	22	ריצברר	1
				51	אעמרדה	2
				56	יפית	2 ריפית
				60	יברא	8
				62	ערפלה	0
				110	יעפר	32-34

FREQUENCY OF PLENE SCRIPT (concluded)

AM. RM	VARIANT NO.	WORD PLENE WITH MT	NO. MSS. DEFECTIVE	VARIANT NO.	WORD PLENE AGAINST MT	NO. MSS. PLENE
RB fin.	15a	לאכול	43	48	להרוג	15
	52a	לראות	1	59	בוא	8
RB cp.	8a	ונורא	3	96	ישבי	8
	33a	ברגדים	33	97	(ה)בוצע	6
	54	(ה)קורא	20	105	ברנה	32-34
	102	ותרטי (=ותרוטא?)	22	125	ישבי	5
				132 cf. 87	[(ה)ארמר]?	0
J.				8	אירם	26-28
TICLE ative	75a	הלוא	48-49	1 57 61 68 81	ולוא	0
	84a	same	46			
	106b	same	43	7 32 63 69	לוא	0
NOMINAL FIX				89 93 100 103 121 122 cf.123	ך=כה	0
NOMINAL RMATIVE Verb				90	ת=וה	2
				92 99 119	same	0

From the above set of charts one will note how very much more frequently a full spelling of the scroll text stands in opposition to the MT than in agreement with it, about forty-eight to fourteen times. In only nineteen of the forty-eight pl. variants of DSH, do the Mss. uphold DSH. This emphasizes the overwhelming pl. character of DSH; but one does not even thus see the true ratio of comparison until he further notes how partial is the testimony of each of the individual Mss.; for, according to the data provided us by Kennicott and Ginsburg, we calculate the least possible number of Mss. that must be amassed to attest these particular nineteen variants is the following seven of Kennicott: 1, 4, 93, 96, 112, 116, 269. To the frequency of attestation within these and other Mss. we shall return later.

We will examine now the frequency of defective script in DSH as compared with the MT and the Heb. Mss.:

FREQUENCY OF DEFECTIVE SCRIPT

M. M	VARIANT NO.	WORD DEFECTIVE WITH MT	NO. MSS PLENE	VARIANT NO.	WORD DEFECTIVE AGAINST MT	NO. MSS. DEF.
N	99a	בשת	1	84	עבטט	0
	106a	קרי׳ה	1 ק׳ר׳ה	cp.129	רמר׳ (רמורה=?)	4 רמרה
B ite	23a	׳עבר	1 ר׳עבור	50	׳חמל	44-45
	39a	(ו)׳גרהו	7-8	90	רה׳ת(ה) (one Yodh)	2
	52c	ר׳ענני	2 ר׳ענ׳נ׳	108	׳גער (one Yodh)	39-40
	57a	׳כזב	1 ׳כו׳ב			
	120a	תסוב	3 ת׳סוב			
B in.				31	רהבט (רהב׳ט)	1
				cp. 36	למשל בר (but cf. Joel 2:17)	
				116	(as 31 above)	2
B p.	19a	ורזנים	14			
	127a	׳צרו	26			
	129a	׳צר	17-18			
ONOM. FFIX				10	סרסר (סרס׳ר=)	0
				13	פרשר (פרש׳ר=)	cp. Kenn. 149
				71	אלר (אל׳ר=)	0
				74	same	0
				83	עלר (על׳ר=)	0
				cp.17	? פנר הם	
				cp.27	לאלוהו (לאלוה׳ר=?)	2 primo ר׳-

The charts show first of all how much less frequently are def. spellings found in DSH than full spellings. They also reveal scr. def. in opposition to the MT in only about twelve cases (where the readings are comparable) as compared with about forty-eight cases of scr. pl. in opposition to the MT.[83] One will further observe how much more evenly are the readings divided between those that agree with the MT against the Mss. and those which agree with the various Mss. against the MT. In fact this time the ratio is slightly favorable to the MT, about ten to seven.

Although the def. spellings are relatively few in number, they are nonetheless significant. Attempts have been made to explain away many of these spellings, in order to remove them from this classification. Thus Elliger,[84] who would restore (incorrectly) רוגז'ם at ii, 13, after Hab. 1:10 (our No. 19a), suggests that instead of the ptcp. we may have to do with a segholate noun of the a class. But Segert's observation (his No. 23) that the plene script is adhered to in Is. 40:23 in the text of DSI[a] is no comfort to this view. When it comes to the def. ptcps. of Hab. 2:18 (our Nos. 127a and 129a), Segert is anxious to convert them into nouns, overlooking in this connection our variant No. 19a, as also the unmistakable זבח'ם of vi, 4. We believe that No. 129, as understood by the author

---

83. Not included in this chart is בגוד' (No. 67) for MT בגד, for there is no identity of form.

84. Op. cit., p. 18.

of DSH, can hardly be the ptcp. Yet it belongs here in the present examination by reason of the probability that in the Vorlage cited by DSH it was intended as a participial form. The defective infinitive הבט (Nos. 31 and 116) is quite remarkable. Habermann points with a *sere*, reading the inf. abs. rather than the inf. con. More probably Elliger[85] is correct in his suggestion that we have to do with an alder orthography conserved here. Most striking of all is the use of ו=וֹ which is practically without parallel in the Medieval Mss. Here no other explanation will do than the retention of an older spelling habit.

A comparison of the ratio of pl. to def. orthography in the Hab. quotations as compared with the commentary reveals a significant trend toward more frequent occurrence of the scr. def. in the quotations. The following chart summarizes the find findings:

HABAKKUK QUOTATIONS				COMMENTARY		
GRAM. FORM	TIMES PLENE	TIMES DEFECTIVA	% DEF.	TIMES PLENE	TIMES DEFECTIVA	% DEF.
Ptcp. long O	8	3	27.2	11	1	8.3
Qal Impf. long O	7	3	30.0	4	1	20.0
Pronom. suffix ו=וֹ	3	5, 6, or 8	62.5, 66.6, or 72.7	4	1-3	20.0-42.8

85. Op. cit., p. 60.

The ptcps. written pl. in the Hab. quotations are Nos. 33a, 54 (cited twice), 96, 97, 102, 105, 125. No. 132 should not be included, because it belongs to a reconstruction; but its inclusion would reduce the percentage of def. occurrence for the Hab. text to 25%. The occurrences pl. in the expository matter are thus: בוגדים (ii, 1, 3, 5), מושל[ם] (iv, 5, 10, 12), הי[שבים] (iv, 8), עושי (vii, 11; viii, 1); עושה (xii, 4) and עובדי (xiii, 3). The sole def. spelling is זבחים (vi, 4).[86] The Qal imperfect, with ו standing for the long O vowel of the second syllable, is represented by Nos. 15, 16a, 22, 51, 60, 67, and 120a. The scr. def. is represented by Nos. 23a, 39a, and 50. In the commentary one reads the following verbs with full spelling: שחוקו' (iv, 6), עבוררו' (iv, 11), קבוצו' (ix, 11), and שופטנו' (xii, 5). The last mentioned is either a special form of the imperfect (after Habermann), or a scribal error for שפוטנו'. In either case it stands opposed to the defective שפטנו' of x, 5--where Elliger (op. cit., p. 62) is seen to be wrong in his suggestion that before the pronominal suffix the O vowel was volatilized.

The use of ו alone without ' to represent the diphthong ēw of the third person masculine singular suffix occurs a minimum of five times (namely, Nos. 10, 13, 71, 74, and 83). We feel reasonably certain of No. 17, though this is a disputed

---

86. We exclude the pl. הבאות of vii, 1 from comparison here, for though it is a matter of the same vowel, it relates to the pl. number, rather than to the ptcp. as such.

reading. Possibly we should also include in our reckoning לאלוהו (Hab. 1:11; No. 27), which is quoted twice (iv, 10, 13). However, the MT interprets the same orthography differently. The three cases of scr. pl. in the Hab. quotations are בגדו (No. 67), צריו (No. 130), and מלפניו (No. 133). The full orthography appears four times in the commentary: עבדיו (ii, 9; vii, 5), אויביו (ix, 10), and עליו (viii, 12). There is one unmistakable example of the scr. def. in the expositions, מצורתו (v, 5). To this should perhaps be added בחירו in one or both of its occurrences (v, 4; ix, 12). In any case, the reference is to the בחירי אל of x, 13. One could perhaps read a collective singular, understanding the corporate Servant of the Lord. Cp. the discussions at פ's 16 and 27 of the commentary.

Seldom is a word of the Hab. text repeated in the expository matter with sufficient identity of form to provide a comparison as to orthography. But עליו of viii, 12 seems to interpret עלו of viii, 7; and עבורו of iv, 11 certainly refers to ועבר of iv, 9. If the document had been fully preserved, perhaps more examples of this contrast could be found.

We are therefore confronted with the anomalous situation of a document which is distinguished preeminently for its scr. pl. being distinguished also by a few significant def. spellings which appear more frequently in the Scriptural material. This serves to suggest that the Hab. Vorlage of the author of the

pesher may have been much more def. than the present Ms., and that through scribal transmission there was a tendency to accommodate the orthography of Hab. to that of the current scr. pl. On the other hand, the fact that a number of significant def. spellings have survived in somewhat greater abundance in the Biblical text than in the interpretative matter would seem to suggest copying by the eye, rather than by the ear. Elliger had not got to the bottom of the matter when he wrote:

> Und zweitens zeigt sich, dass kein Unterschied der Schreibung zwischen den beiden Textgruppen besteht, dass also dem Ausleger in dieser Beziehung keine von seiner eigenen, normalen abweichende kanonische Schreibweise eines heiligen Textes vorlag.[87]

However, he is right in the generality that both citation and commentary are characterized by similar orthographic practice and that sometimes the spelling of DSH is not to be regarded as representing the primitive script of the Prophet Habakkuk, nor even of the Vorlage of the author of our pesher. This becomes particularly clear from our list of other orthographic features, nearly all of which represent late or dialectic spelling. Our graphic presentation of this data follows:

---

87. Op. cit., pp. 60 f.

SPECIAL ORTHOGRAPHIC PECULIARITIES

TRAIT		VARIANT NO.	DSH	MT
Metathetic ʾAleph		5 42 55 58 65 104 111 126	כ'א	כ'
Elision of ʾAleph	in verb	40	ר'ספהר	ר'אספהר
		80	ר'ומרר	ר'אמר
		cp.#4	ר'אשם=ר'שם ?	ראשם
	in noun, after article	135	הרץ	הארץ
	in adj.	44	בר'א=בר'	בר'אה=בראה (wrong gender)

SPECIAL ORTHOGRAPHIC PECULIARITIES (concluded)

TRAIT	VARIANT NO.	DSH	MT
Aramaism infinitive (variant's origin)	29	למרכיחו	להרכיח
noun	cf.6	הכשדאים	הכשדים
Prosaic Pronoun for poetic	25	זה	זר
Pronominal Suffix shorter	43	בהם	בהמה
longer	131	עליהו	עלי׳ר
late orthography for early	16 37	כולו	כלה
Preposition, later usage	107	מעם	מאת
	133	מלפניו	מפני׳ר
Verb apocopation	35	ותעש	ותעשה
contraction elision of Hê in Niphʿal inf.	98	לנצל	להנצל
assimilation of Taw? (or Pʿel)	19	יקלס	יתקלס
cf. elision of ʾAleph (above)			

Of these variants, only the one illustration of apocopation certainly represents more classical usage. There is a possibility, it seems, that the longer form of the pronominal suffix, so characteristic of DSI[a], represents an older pronunciation than the briefer forms of the later Qumran Mss. However, we suspect that בהם (No. 43) may represent a more ancient orthography than בהמה, though the latter with the addition of ה as a vowel letter represents the more ancient pronunciation.[88] Similarly הוראה and ה'אה of the Isaiah Scroll, which are entirely absent from the Hab. quotations of DSH, set forth with ה as a mater lectionis the more ancient pronunciation of הורא and ה'א. Probably both spelling and pronunciation were short in late popular usage.

2. Principal Variants

The following charts of principal variants are presented for the purpose of convenient reference, but especially for the sake of giving a general perspective to our study.

---

88. Or, probably, one should rather say that they represent the more classical and literary usage; for longer and shorter forms doubtless existed side by side at a late date, with the longer forms surviving mostly in literature, and the shorter forms prevailing in popular speech. Perhaps this distinction was manifesting itself already in the time of the prophet, both in pronunciation and in orthography. Cp. Frank Moore Cross and David Noel Freedman, Early Hebrew Orthography, (American Oriental Series, vol. 36), New Haven, 1952, pp. 56 f., 66 f.

PRINCIPAL VARIANTS

GRAM. FORM	VARIANT NO.	HAB. REF.	DSH	MT	EVALUATION
ADJ.	44	1:16	ברי'א=ברי'	בראה	superior
ARTICLE added	2	1:4	המשפט		?
	54	2:2	הקורא		?
	97	2:9	הברצע		?
	112	2:14	הי[ם]		?
	132	2:19	?[האומר]		?
CONJUNC. Waw added	20	1:10	והוא		superior
	34	1:13	ותחרישׁ		?
	39	1:15	יעלה וי'גרהו	העלה יגרהו	superior
	49	1:17	ולוא יחמל		inferior?
	61	2:3	ולוא יאחר		superior
	81	2:6	ולוא לו		inferior
	86	2:7	וי'קומו		inferior
	93	2:8	וישלוכה		?
Waw omitted	47	1:17	תמיד		?
	69	2:5	לוא ישבע		?
	115	2:15	אף		inferior

PRINCIPAL VARIANTS (continued)

GRAM. FORM	VARIANT NO.	HAB. REF.	DSH	MT	EVALUATION
NOUN different	46	1:17	חרבר	חרמר	superior
	66	2:5	הרן	היין	superior
	118	2:15	מרעדיקם (or ptcp?)	מעוריהם	inferior
	129	2:18	ומרי	ומורה	inferior
pl. for sing.	113	2:15	רעיהר	רעהר	?
	130	2:18	יצריו	יצרו	?
for inf.	101	2:10	קצרות	קצות	inferior
for ptcp.	102	2:10	וחוסי	וחסא	inferior
VERB different root	24	1:11	וישם	ואשם	as good, if שם=שמם=אשם.
	88	2:7	ויקיצו	ויקצו	inferior
	120	2:16	והרעל	והערל	superior
different stem	19	1:10	יקלס	יתקלס	inferior
	64	2:4	ישרה	ישרה	superior
	70	2:5	ויאספו	ויאסף	inferior
	73	2:5	ויקבצו	ויקבץ	inferior
	123	2:17	יחתה	יחיתן	superior, if =יחתכה.

PRINCIPAL VARIANTS (continued)

GRAM. FORM	VARIANT NO.	HAB. REF.	DSH	MT	EVALUATION
VERB different number	33	1:13	תבי֫טו	תבי֫ט	inferior
	80	2:6	ו֫ימרו	ו֫יאמר	superior
different tense	38	1:15	יעלה	העלה	superior
	67	2:5	יבגוד	בגד	?
	82	2:6	יכביד	ומכביד	inferior
infin. for ptcp.	36	1:14	למשל	לא-משל	inferior
ptcp. for infin.	29	1:12	למוכיחו (or Aramaism?)	להוכיח	inferior
ptcp. for noun	79	2:6	ומליצי	ומליצה	inferior
finite for noun	12	1:8	ופרשו	פרשיו	superior
	28	1:12	וצור (?יצור)	וצור	inferior
PREPOSITION added	30	1:13	ברע	רע	inferior
different	117	2:15	אל	על	?
PRONOMINAL SUFFIX added to noun	52	2:1	מצורי	מצור	superior
added to verb	29	1:12	למוכיחו	להוכיח	inferior
omitted from verb	127	2:18	פסל	פסלו	inferior
different person	114	2:15	חמתו	חמתך	superior

PRINCIPAL VARIANTS (concluded)

FEATURE	VARIANT NO.	HAB. REF.	DSH	MT	EVALUATION
OMISSION of word	76 cf.96	2:6		אלה	superior
of He loc.	18	1:9	קדים	קדימה	superior
of interrog.	45	1:17	על כן	העל כן	superior
of chapter?	135a	3:1 ff.	absent	present	superior
of conjunc. Waw, see above.					
of pronom. suffix, see above					
WORD ORDER	12-13	1:8	ופרשו פרשו	פרשיו ופרשיו	superior
	41	1:15 f.	2 orders cited		1st inferior
	78	2:6	משל עליו	עליו משל	superior

In addition to the above variants, one may note the following SCRIBAL ERRORS: Nos.9, 41, 85, 89, 123. These were uncorrected. The following are the corrected ones: Nos.10a, 11, 22, 29a, 53a, 96, 111a, 119a, 121a. With this listing, one may compare Segert (his Nos.207-219).

The general survey of the principal variants reveals a total of more than fifty for the extant portions of the

first two chapters of Hab. The evaluation gives three types of judgment. "Superior" and "inferior" readings are about equal in number, each being slightly more than a third of the total. The qualified and questionable readings are about a fourth of the total. On the whole (as seen previously) the orthography of the MT is more classical; and, though its readings are not always correct, it does not contain so many bad ones as DSH. Therefore, in all cases of doubt, the safer criterion would be to follow the MT. So concise an evaluation of these principal variants, of course, does not do justice to any of them. One must consult the discussion of each one as it is presented in its place under the collation. The lines of evidence presented there may perhaps lead another mind to conclude differently.

3. The Character of the Recension

J. van der Ploeg[89] and Paul Kahle[90] have been fond of classifying the Hab. text of our pesher as one of the "vulgar texts" which were current before the reorganization of Judaism. As a vulgar text, it would compare with DSI^a as opposed to DSI^b. Kahle regards it as similar to the text of the Greek recension from the vicinity of the Muraba'at caves. It appears that it

---

89. BO, VIII, 1, 1951, p. 4.

90. ThLZ, 1954, No. 2, col. 84; No. 7/8, col. 479.

may be contrasted with the newly found Hebrew text of the Minor Prophets from the same region--the discovery of which is announced as we conclude the present study. In his survey article van der Ploeg declares:

> An investigation of the text of Hab. 1-2 in DSH has brought to light that this is not simply of a vulgar character, but also that it stands as a distinct recension; where it shows deviations from MT, this stems mostly from the ancient versions, so that we thus have to do with another text type. From this it seems to follow that the text is more likely old than young.[91]

An examination of the text in relation to the commentary reveals that the interpretations are often so dependent upon these particular variants that they are altogether essential to the interpretation and point of view expressed there. This was declared to be one of the basic hermeneutic principles of the document.[92] Since these variants lend themselves to the sectarian interpretation of history, they are in some sense to be classed as sectarian.

The origin of the sectarian readings is an important question. G. Molin, who thinks that many of the variants represent conscious alterations of the text for the sake of interpretation,[93] suggests further that many lean upon the LXX, or upon the Heb. Vorlage thereof. This last serves to suggest that some of the variants have been culled from various

---

91. Ex Oriente Lux (Jaarbericht No. 12, pp. 235 f.

92. BA, XIV, No. 3, 1951, p. 61 (H. P. 3).

93. ThZ, VIII, 1952, p. 357.

manuscripts or versions. The principle of eclecticism was implicit here, as also in my previous study,[94] where I stated: "Thus most likely the peculiar readings of DSH were discovered in some manuscript (or manuscripts) [sic.] and were treated as authoritative." It remained for Karl Elliger (op. cit., p. 148) and especially for Krister Stendahl[95] to develop the principle. In the case of Elliger it was largely a matter of amassing textual corruptions for the sake of desired interpretations. Stendahl emphasized agreements between DSH and the ancient versions:

> All this must now be much more than chance agreement. The peculiar way in which DSH coincides both with those readings differing from the M. T. and with the M. T.'s own makes it inadequate to say that DSH's Hebrew text was the one which is supported by the said Versions. We must rather presume that DSH was conscious of various possibilities, tried them out, and allowed them to enrich its interpretation of the prophet's message, which in all its forms was fulfilled in and through the Teacher of Righteousness.

One may often suspect textual alteration for the sake of interpretation, but where the reading may be explained by a common type of scribal error, or where it is to be found in agreement with the versions, the charge of deliberate alteration is hazardous. At first one was inclined to agree with L. Rost[96] regarding Hab. 2:5:

---

94. Op. cit., p. 73.

95. The School of St. Matthew, Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, XX, Uppsala, 1954, pp. 185-190.

96. ThLZ, 1950, No. 8, col. 480.

The most interesting reading found is הרן instead of ה״ין for here has the enlistment of the sect against wealth shaped the text and thereby has created the prooftext for the thoroughgoing rejection of private property.

The observation that this is the presumed Vorlage of both G and S (see No. 66), however, discredits the charge of deliberate alteration. The sect's animus against private property doubtless did influence their attachment to this reading and to their particular interpretation whereby הרן was vocalized as hôn (wealth) rather than as hawwān (presumptuous one).

The reading which is most likely to have arisen from deliberate alteration is מרעדיהם (No. 118), appearing for מערוריהם of MT Hab. 2:15. According to Enoch (H.) Yalon, one finds here an illustration of the Rabbinic method of textual alteration, but without the usual formula of warning, אל תקרי.[97] With this judgment Molin agreed (op. cit., p. 355):

Das ist sicher eine eigenmächtige Aenderung (so auch Yalon), die nur dem Wünsche ihre Entstehung verdankt, ein ganz bestimmtes Ereignis in der Geschichte der Sekte als längst vorhergesagt hinzustellen. Das zeigt die folgende Erklärung ganz deutlich.

A better analogy, it seems to us, for such alteration would be the tiqqune has-soferim, which are described by Jacob Lauterbach:[98]

---

97. Kirjath Sepher, xxvii, Nos. 2-3, June, 1951, p. 175.

98. Rabbinic Essays, Cincinnati, 1951, pp. 191 ff.

The Soferim were able to do this because they were also the actual scribes whose business it was to prepare copies of the Book of the Law. If they desired to teach a certain law, custom, or practice, because they considered it as part of the religious teachings, although it could not be found in, or interpreted into, the Book of the Law, they would cause it to be indicated by some slight change in the text. For instance, by adding or omitting a letter, or by the peculiar spelling of a word they could bring about the desired result. They did not hesitate to do so, because they did not in any way change the law as they understood it.

The motivation for such changes in the Essene scrolls would be prophetic application to their sectarian history, rather than legalistic adaptation. In the present case, as pointed out in the collation, the same reading is echoed also in one of the sect's hymns. This does not necessarily indicate that either DSH or DST are dependent upon each other here, but they may rather depend upon a special Hebrew manuscript. It could well be that the sect possessed a manuscript containing precisely the Hab. text of DSH and that eclecticism and even deliberate alteration influenced the formation of that text. Another case where textual alteration might be suspected is that of הב׳טר (No. 33, Hab. 1:13), where the plural number of the verb reinforces the application of the verse to "the house of Absalom and the men of his council," rather than to God, as certainly meant by the original prophet. The inconsistent number, standing as it does beside the singular ורחרישׁ, may be compared with such inconsistencies in DSI^{a} as הלכו of Is. 50:10, where perhaps the plural number serves to reinforce the corporate interpretation of the Lord's Servant.

Though deliberate alteration may have played a part in the formation of the Hab. text utilized in DSH, it was probably

resorted to but rarely. Many divergent texts were current from which one might well select the reading most advantageous to the purpose at hand. This in no way minimizes the importance of individual readings in the scroll; for where readings were found (as attested by the versions) rather than invented (i.e., coined), our scroll presents the invaluable proof that such a reading certainly existed in Hebrew by the 1st century B.C. A reading is to be judged neither as superior, nor as inferior, simply because it stands in our scroll. Every reading must stand or fall in its own right, according to the strength of corroborating attestation and according to its own intrinsic merits. To those variants which are judged superior on this basis, DSH lends the halo of established antiquity. Quite as often, even more often, DSH either directly or indirectly substantiates the antiquity of the readings of the MT. This does not necessarily prove that all such readings of the MT are correct, for in some cases one will simply conclude that the corruption found in the MT is merely shown to have been an ancient one.

4. The Presence of Dual Readings

An original thesis of the present writer is that the expositions in DSH sometimes attest a reading at variance with the first, or directly cited, one. Two examples of this feature

were noted in the initial publication;[99] and three others were added later to this list of "dual readings."[100] The complete list is as follows:

DUAL READINGS

VARIANT NO.	HAB. REF.	DSH	MT	COMMENTARY
15	1:8	מרחוק יעופו	מרחוק יבאו יעופו	ממרחק יבואו
24	1:11	ו֯ישם	ואשם	ב֯ית אשמ[תם]
41	1:15 f.	[על כן יזבח לחרמו על כן ישמח [ו֯יגיל ו֯יקטר למכמרתו]	על כן ישמח ו֯יגיל על כן יזבח לחרמו ו֯יקטר למכמרתו	כן יזבח לחרמו יקטר למכמרתו
118	2:15	מועדיהם	מעוריהם	אברת גלותו
120	2:16	והרעל	והערל	לוא מל את ערלת לבו

In addition to the above examples, one has noted the seeming discrepancy between מדמי אדם (xii, 1; Hab. 2:17) and מדמי קריה (xii, 6 f.). The genesis of the second phrasing, however, is readily explained when it is examined in the context of Hab. 2:17b:

---

99. BASOR, 112, 1948, p. 17, n. 21.

100. BASOR, 114, 1949, p. 9; BA, XIV, 3, 1951, p. 63.

Because of the blood of men and violence to the land,
The city and all who dwell in it.

Ellipsis occurs before the word "city." Possibly one is to understand "violence to the city"; but the pesher understands "blood of the city." Moreover, it can also be explained as a case of selective quotation, which with modern techniques of printing would appear: "because of the blood of . . . the city." As observed already in DSS I, p. xx, this "free manner of quoting" sufficiently explains the present case, and one is not to think of this as a variant to the main citation.

When Dupont-Sommer wrote in 1950,[101] the case of 1:8 (No. 15) had not been proposed. He recognized the discrepancy of No. 41, of course, and quite naturally grouped together the other three in his discussion of the commentator's method:

Le commentateur, dans ces trois passages, connaissait donc les deux variants, à la fois celle qu'il retient dans la citation et celle du TM; Il semble que, pour lui, le texte sacré soit si chargé d'inspiration divine que les deux leçons lui paraissent également fondées et valables, du fait que cette dualité donne lieu--et c'est l'essentiel--à une plus grande richesse de sens spirituel.[102]

Paul Kahle has observed[103] the phenomenon of duality in connection with Hab. 1:8, 11; 2:16. Krister Stendahl has taken into account all the examples[104] and has pointed out the same

---

101. RHR, CXXXVII, 2, pp. 143, 149 f.

102. Ibid., p. 143.

103. Biblia Hebraica, 7th ed.

104. Op. cit., pp. 186-189.

technique of interpretation in the Gospel according to Matthew.[105]

Karl Elliger has challenged this position.[106] He claims that the language of the commentary in connection with Nos. 24 and 120 is characteristic of the Qumran sectarian literature. He also observes the indirect character of the allusion in the commentary to No. 118. However, his arguments appear weak, when one asks why such language should appear in each case only where it corresponds with a reading of the MT! His suggestion of two other examples of what he regards a doubtful phenomenon are not in character with the others, but they would reverse the process, putting the reading of the MT in the quotation and the reading of G in the interpretation. The reading גורגר'ם (No. 3) is doubtless the form of the quotation on the part of DSH (which unfortunately is not preserved), there being no echo of the other reading in the commentary. When it comes to גבורי'ם of ii, 12, there is a bare possibility of the influence of the LXX, but cp. No. 6.

For our part we are inclined to remove No. 118 from this classification. The phrase אבות גלותו is probably not to be understood ambiguously as at first believed and as represented in Elliger's translation: "ihn blosszustellen (oder: abzusetzen

---

105. Ibid., pp. 197 f.

106. Op. cit., pp. 132 f.

107. Op. cit., p. 212.

i.e., "to lay him bare (or to exile him)." G. Molin comments: "Auch גלותו XI, 6 in seiner Doppeldeutigkeit (wenn auch der Hauptsinn wohl auf die Vertreibung der Sekte hinweist) stimmt zum MT."[108] It appears, however, that the first word should not be read as the Qal inf. of √גלה but rather as בבית=אבית (or אל בית). Habermann and Yalon had proposed this on the basis of the Talmudic idiom, and the antiquity of the expression seems to be attested in the Beth Mashko letter from Muraba'at, although it is still somewhat younger then DSH.[109] Dupont-Sommer, who has engaged in considerable controversy over the passage, immediately accepted the evidence of the new documentation.[110] Now, if we accept this reading of the phrase, all ambiguity vanishes and the reference is to exile rather than bodily exposure. Elliger rejects the construction on syntactical grounds; but this difficulty is not insurmountable, as we shall show in connection with the expository material of ¶31. Consequently, we voluntarily remove No. 118 from this list of dual readings.

In reaching a final conclusion regarding the four seemingly double readings (after eliminating No. 118), three factors are for us decisive: (1) the improbability of a whole series of accidental textual coincidences of this kind, (2) the congruity of

---

108. Op. cit., p. 355.

109. This datum was first disclosed by R. de Vaux, RB, April, 1953, pp. 270 ff.

110. The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes, London, 1954, p. 176.

this with the principle of eclecticism advanced by both Elliger and Stendahl, and (3) the unambiguous direct quotations in the case of No. 41. It is to be pointed out with regard to the second factor that if the author collected readings from various sources, it is impossible to deny his acquaintance with these readings of MT. It is quite certain that he was acquainted with the Targum, which, as we possess it, attests every one of these MT readings. Though the Targum as known to our author may possibly have differed in its text at one or more of these points, the presumption must favor agreement. Hence we conclude that our author probably knew these readings through the Targum, if not from any other source. Admittedly the echo of the variant readings would be only indirect if mediated solely through the Targum (which one need not suppose), but for the purposes of textual criticism this in no way diminishes their importance as attesting the readings of the MT alongside the variant text directly quoted. As regards the third factor, one must note that here we are concerned with direct quotation in Hebrew, and that for both orders there are corresponding Greek readings. The first form of the citation is doubtless due to scribal error; but no scribe of DSH has ventured to correct this clear discrepancy in its text. It seems likely, therefore, to have belonged to a Heb. Vorlage of the author.

5. The Medieval Manuscripts

A by-product of the present study may be to awaken interest in the question of whether pre-Massoretic readings are to be found in the Heb. Mss. collated by Kennicott, Ginsburg, and de Rossi. It may be of importance to know the extent of agreement in the various documents cited in our collation. In the following chart we list the fifty-one most frequently agreeing documents in the order of frequency. These are selected from a much larger total, most of which contain only one or two attestations of the variants of DSH. We list all those supporting DSH three or more times.

In the calculation of agreements, we give first of all the number of exact agreements. Then we list parenthetically the number of partial or approximate agreements. These generally involve coincidence of full or defective script at some point or other, but with other difference of text. These may be important as indicating a tendency of a given document to employ such orthographic practices. We list separately also the primo and nunc readings, which are not included in the straight agreements. Since de Rossi's Mss. are not found among the first fifty-one, a Roman numeral indicates a document of Kennicott. A Hebrew numeral (of course) indicates a document of Ginsburg. Our chart follows:

ANALYSIS OF MSS. MOST FREQUENTLY AGREEING WITH DSH

Ms.	Orthographic Agreements Plene	Defective	Mixed	Other Agree.	Total Agree.	Times more Plene than either	Times more Defective than either
12	14 (4)				14 (+4)	5	4
1	6	1 (1)	1	3	11 (+1)	1	6
224	5 (2)	1		4 1 nunc	10 (+3)	1	7
96	7 (2)	1 (1)		1	9 (+3)	5	5
150	3 (2)	1 (1)		4 (1)	8 (+4)	3	7
154	5	(1)		2 1 forte (1)	7 (+3)	3	7
30	3 (1)	1 (1)	1	2	7 (+2)		8
72	4 (1)	1 (1)		2	7 (+2)		6
89	5 (1)	1		1	7 (+1)	2	7
258	4 (1)	1		2	7 (+1)	3	8
17	5 (3)	1 (1)			6 (+4)	1	6
178	4 (1)	1 (1)		1 or 2	6 or 7 (+2)	2	7
93	5	(1)			6 (+1)	1	7
'	4 (1)	1		1	6 (+1)	2	7
4	2 (2)	1 (1)		2	5 (+3)	1	6
139	2 (1)	1 (1)		2	5 (+2)	1	2
R'	4 (1)	(1)		1	5 (+2)	1	4

ANALYSIS OF MSS. MOST FREQUENTLY SUPPORTING DSH AGAINST MT
(continued)

Ms.	Orthographic Agreements Plene	Defective	Other Agree.	Total Agree	Times more Plene than either	Times more Defective than either
126	3 (1)	1	1	5 (+1)	2	7
182	3 (1)	1	1	5 (+1)		4
ג	3	1 (1)	1	5 (+1)	2	6
סס	4 (1)		1	5 (+1)	2	4
כר	2 (1)	1	2	5 (+1)	1	4
ר"א	3 (1)	1	1	5 (+1)		6
252	2 (1)	1 (2)	1	4 (+3)	1	5
ז	2 (1)	1 (1)	1	4 (+2)	2	7
כא	3 (1)	(1)	1	4 (+2)		3
102	3	(1)	1	4 (+1)	1	4
113	3 1 primo	1		4 (+1)		3
155	3	(1)	1	4 (+1)	1	
158	2	2 (1)		4 (+1)		6
180	2	(1)	2	4 (+1)		
260	3 (1)		1	4 (+1)	1	7
לד	3 (1)	1		4 (+1)	1	5
226	3		1	4	1	

ANALYSIS OF MSS. MOST FREQUENTLY SUPPORTING DSH AGAINST MT
(concluded)

Mss.	Orthographic Agreements Plene	Defective	Other Agree.	Total Agree.	Times more Plene than either	Times more Defective than either
ב	1		3	4		2
2	2 (1)	(1)	1 1 nunc	3 (+3)		7
29	2 (1)	1 (1)	(1)	3 (+3)	1	7
369	3 (2)	(1)		3 (+3)		1
116	2 (1)	1 (1)		3 (+2)		6
172	2	1 (1)	1 primo	3 (+2)	1	8
253	3 (2)			3 (+2)		5
מ	2 (2)	1		3 (+2)	2	5
23	2	(1)	1	3 (+1)	2	3
ג'	2	(1)	1	3 (+1)	1	5
מר	2	(1)	1	3 (+1)		3
כר	2	(1)	1	3 (+1)	1	6
כז	2 (1)	1		3 (+1)	1	8
נת	3	(1)		3 (+1)	2	3
ר"י	2 (1)		1	3 (+1)		5
173	1	1	1	3		1
לז	2	1		3		4

The above analysis shows how relatively few are the attestations of any one manuscript for the variants of DSH. The readings most frequently coincide in cases of scr. pl. This fact might give one an entirely wrong impression of the manuscripts, if it were not for the last two columns on the right hand side of the chart, which reveal a strong tendency on the part of the Mss. toward defective spelling, reading def. very often in cases where DSH and the MT concur in the use of full spelling. On the other hand, the figures in the last column exceed those in the column immediately preceding for the obvious reason that DSH is written so fully that there are only rare opportunities for any Ms. to be written more fully. However, if one adds together the figures for the left and right hand columns concerned respectively with pl. and def. orthography, he will find that in most cases the variants involving defective spelling equal or surpass in number those involving full orthography. DSH with its greater preponderance of scr. pl. (not only in ratio, but in absolute number) is sharply distinguished from these manuscripts.

There seems to be no relationship between the number of purely orthographic agreements and the number of other and more fundamental concurrences of text. Kenn. 112 has a total of fourteen agreements which are simply illustrations of full spelling, for which the manuscript has a marked tendency. On the other hand, Kenn. 145 and 651 have only two agreements, but they are non-orthographic in nature. Those for Kenn. 145 are Nos. 30 and 61; those for Kenn. 651, Nos. 30 and 117.

There are only four documents with as many as three non-orthographic concurrences of text with DSH variants. A list of the variants under which their testimony is cited may serve to illustrate the statistical facts that have gone into the above chart.

s.	Non-orthographic Agreements	Orthographic Agreements	Variants Plene	Variants Defective
1	25, 30, 61	Plene: 8, 15, 53, 68, 91, 110. Defective: 50, cp. 108 Mixed: 90	52c	15a, 16a, 75a, 84a, 106b, 120a
4	49, 61, 81, 117; nunc, 30	Plene: 8, 15, 77, 91, 105, cp. 44 & 53 Defective: 50	127a	15a, 16a, 75a, 84a, 86, 106b, 120a
0	30, 61, 115, 117, cp. 16	Plene: 8, 15, 105, cp. 44 & 53 Defective: 50, cp. 108	99a, 127a, 129a	15a, 16a, 75a, 84a, 86, 106b, 120a
	20, 30, 69	Plene: 110		54, 75a

This does not fully represent the texts of these documents, there being other data not capable of citation here, but it may serve to illustrate in the case of the first three documents that there is considerable affinity between certain Mss. without there being full identity. In fact we have found no two of the variant manuscripts fully identical with each other. Our investigations would seem to point to the mixed character of the Mss., doubtless due (at least in part) to the standardizing influence of the MT.

We suspect that most of the agreements between the Medieval Mss. and DSH are coincidental, since they are representative of the sort of variants that are most likely to occur in textual transmission. In any case, the text of DSH cannot be regarded as even a distant cousin of any Medieval text; for of its 136 variants only a very small percentage is found in any one manuscript, and even an amassing of the variants of all the manuscripts can provide attestation for no more than about thirty of them. Thus the Habakkuk Pesher from the first Qumran scroll cave has a unique place in the textual criticism of the Prophet Habakkuk.

DATE DUE

FEB 0 2 2008			
JUN 3 0 2014			

HIGHSMITH #45115

DATE DUE

[redacted]

MAR 2 8 2001

NOV 2 1 2001

Printed in USA

HIGHSMITH #45230

BS1635 .H3B88
The text of Habakkuk in the ancient
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00117 5985